arXiv:1601.04973v1 [math.SG] 19 Jan 2016

ON THE EQUIVALENCE OF CONTACT INVARIANTS IN SUTURED FLOER HOMOLOGY THEORIES

JOHN A. BALDWIN AND STEVEN SIVEK

Abstract. We recently defined an invariant of contact manifolds with convex boundary in Kronheimer and Mrowka's sutured monopole Floer homology theory. Here, we prove that there is an isomorphism between sutured monopole Floer homology and sutured Heegaard Floer homology which identifies our invariant with the contact class defined by Honda, Kazez and Matić in the latter theory. One consequence is that the Legendrian invariants in knot Floer homology behave functorially with respect to Lagrangian concordance. In particular, these invariants provide computable and effective obstructions to the existence of such concordances. Our work also provides the first proof which does not rely on the relative Giroux correspondence that the vanishing or non-vanishing of Honda, Kazez and Matić's contact class is a well-defined invariant of contact manifolds.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this article is to establish an equivalence between two invariants of contact 3-manifolds with boundary—one defined using Heegaard Floer homology and the other using monopole Floer homology. Our equivalence fits naturally into the ongoing program of establishing connections between the many different instantiations of Floer theory. In addition to the theoretical appeal of such connections, an equivalence between invariants in different Floer homological settings allows one to combine the intrinsic advantages of the different settings, often with interesting topological or geometric consequences. This principle is illustrated nicely by Taubes's isomorphism between monopole Floer homology and embedded contact homology [53, 54, 55, 56, 57], whose first step, a correspondence between monopoles and Reeb orbit sets, proved the Weinstein conjecture for 3-manifolds [58].

Our work provides another illustration of this principle. Indeed, one of the great advantages of Heegaard Floer homology is its computability. On the other hand, monopole Floer homology enjoys a certain functoriality with respect to exact symplectic cobordism which has yet to be proven in the Heegaard Floer setting. The equivalence described in this paper enables us to combine these advantages to give a new, computable obstruction to the existence of Lagrangian concordances between Legendrian knots, a subject of much recent interest. Another application of our equivalence is a Giroux-correspondence-free proof that the contact invariant in sutured Heegaard Floer homology is well-defined.

JAB was supported by NSF Grants DMS-1104688, DMS-1406383, and NSF CAREER Grant DMS-1454865. SS was supported by NSF Grants DMS-1204387 and DMS-1506157.

Below, we describe our equivalence and its applications in more detail. We then indicate our strategy of proof and discuss potential applications of this strategy outside the realm of contact geometry. We work in characteristic 2 throughout this paper.

1.1. **Our equivalence.** Let us first recall the invariants of *closed* contact 3-manifolds defined by Kronheimer and Mrowka and by Ozsváth and Szabó. Suppose (Y,ξ) is a closed contact 3-manifold, and η is an oriented curve in Y. In [24, 25], Kronheimer and Mrowka associate to such data a class

$$c_{HM}(\xi) \in \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y,\mathfrak{s}_\xi;\Gamma_\eta)^1$$

in the monopole Floer homology of $-Y$ with local coefficients. Here, $\mathfrak{s}_\xi$ is the Spin^c structure on $-Y$ associated with ξ, and Γ_η is a local system on the monopole Floer configuration space with fiber a Novikov ring Λ. In [44], Ozsváth and Szabó likewise define a class

$$c_{HF}(\xi) \in HF^+(-Y,\mathfrak{s}_\xi;\Gamma_\eta)$$

in Heegaard Floer homology with local coefficients, but by very different means. Remarkably, these two invariants are equivalent. This is made precise in the theorem below, which follows from Taubes' work [53, 54, 55, 56, 57] together with work of Colin, Ghiggini, and Honda [10, 11, 9] on the isomorphism between Heegaard Floer homology and embedded contact homology.[2]

Theorem 1.1 (Taubes, Colin–Ghiggini–Honda)**.** *For every $\mathfrak{s} \in Spin^c(-Y)$, there is an isomorphism of $\Lambda[U]$-modules*

$$\Phi_\mathfrak{s} : HF^+(-Y,\mathfrak{s};\Gamma_\eta) \to \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y,\mathfrak{s};\Gamma_\eta),$$

such that $\Phi_{\mathfrak{s}_\xi}(c_{HF}(\xi)) = c_{HM}(\xi)$.

This article sets out to establish a similar equivalence for invariants of contact 3-manifolds *with boundary*, or, more precisely, *sutured contact manifolds.* These are triples (M,Γ,ξ) where (M,ξ) is a contact 3-manifold with convex boundary and dividing set $\Gamma \subset \partial M$. In [19], Honda, Kazez, and Matić associate to such data a class

$$c_{HF}(\xi) \in SFH(-M,-\Gamma)^3$$

in the sutured Heegaard Floer homology of $(-M,-\Gamma)$ which, in a sense, generalizes Ozsváth and Szabó's invariant of closed contact manifolds (it generalizes the *hat* version of Ozsváth and Szabó's invariant). In [3], we gave a similar generalization of Kronheimer and Mrowka's invariant. Ours assigns to a sutured contact manifold a class

$$c_{HM}(\xi) \in \underline{SHM}(-M,-\Gamma)^4$$

in a version of sutured monopole Floer homology with local coefficients.[5] Our main theorem is the following, settling a conjecture made in [3, Conjecture 1.9].

[1] In [24, 25], this class is denoted by ψ.

[2] See also the work of Kutluhan, Lee, and Taubes [28, 29, 30, 31, 32].

[3] In [19], this class is denoted by EH.

[4] In [3], this class is denoted by ψ.

[5] In fact, our invariant can be made to take values in the "natural" refinement of $\underline{SHM}$ defined in [6].

Theorem 1.2 (Main Theorem)**.** *There is an isomorphism of* Λ*-modules*

$$SFH(-M,-\Gamma)\otimes\Lambda\to\underline{SHM}(-M,-\Gamma),$$

sending $c_{HF}(\xi)\otimes 1$ *to* $c_{HM}(\xi)$*.*

1.2. **Applications.** In order to define $c_{HF}(\xi)$—in both the *closed* and *with boundary* settings—one first chooses an open book compatible with ξ. The existing proofs that $c_{HF}(\xi)$ does not depend on this choice rely on Giroux's correspondence—in particular, on its assertion that any two open books compatible with ξ are related by a sequence of positive stabilizations. By contrast, our construction of $c_{HM}(\xi)$ is logically independent of this assertion. One immediate application of Theorem 1.2 is therefore a proof of the following well-definedness result from [19] that is logically independent of Giroux's correspondence.

Theorem 1.3 (Honda–Kazez–Matić)**.** *For any sutured contact manifold* (M,Γ,ξ)*, the vanishing or non-vanishing of* $c_{HF}(\xi)$ *does not depend on the choices made in its construction.* □

The main topological application of Theorem 1.2 in this paper is to the study of Lagrangian concordance initiated by Chantraine in [8]. Recall that for Legendrian knots $K_1,K_2\subset(Y,\xi)$, K_1 is *Lagrangian concordant* to K_2—written $K_1\prec K_2$—if there is an embedded Lagrangian cylinder C in the symplectization of (Y,ξ) such that

$$C\cap((-\infty,-T)\times Y)=(-\infty,-T)\times K_1,$$
$$C\cap((T,\infty)\times Y)=(T,\infty)\times K_2$$

for some $T>0$. Two Legendrian knots related by Lagrangian concordance must have the same classical invariants (Thurston-Bennequin and rotation numbers) [8]. A challenging problem, therefore, which has attracted a lot of recent attention, is to find tools for deciding whether two knots with the same classical invariants are Lagrangian concordant. Note that this is more difficult than the already formidable task of deciding whether two smoothly isotopic knots with the same classical invariants are Legendrian isotopic.

In [5], we defined a Legendrian invariant which assigns to a Legendrian $K\subset(Y,\xi)$ a class

$$\mathcal{L}_{HM}(K)\in\underline{KHM}(-Y,K)$$

in monopole knot Floer homology with local coefficients. It is defined in terms of a certain contact structure ξ_K on the sutured knot complement $Y(K)$ with two meridional sutures,

$$\mathcal{L}_{HM}(K):=c_{HM}(\xi_K)\in\underline{SHM}(-Y(K))=:\underline{KHM}(-Y,K). \tag{1}$$

Furthermore, we used the functoriality of c_{HM} under exact symplectic cobordism (a feature whose analogue in Heegaard Floer homology has not been established independently of Theorem 1.1) to show that $\mathcal{L}_{HM}$ behaves functorially under Lagrangian concordance, as follows.

Theorem 1.4 (Baldwin–Sivek)**.** *If* $K_1,K_2\subset(Y,\xi)$ *are Legendrian with* $K_1\prec K_2$*, then there is a map*

$$\underline{KHM}(-Y,K_2)\to\underline{KHM}(-Y,K_1),$$

sending $\mathcal{L}_{HM}(K_2)$ *to* $\mathcal{L}_{HM}(K_1)$*.*

In this way, the class $\mathcal{L}_{HM}$ provides an obstruction to the existence of Lagrangian concordances between Legendrian knots. Unfortunately, this class is not easily computable. A much more computable Legendrian invariant is that defined by Lisca, Ozsváth, Stipsicz, and Szabó in [36]. Theirs takes the form of a class

$$\mathcal{L}_{HF}(K) \subset \widehat{HFK}(-Y,K)$$

in Heegaard knot Floer homology. Though originally defined in terms of open books for (Y,ξ), Stipsicz and Vértesi discovered in [52] that it can also be formulated as

$$\mathcal{L}_{HF}(K) = c_{HF}(\xi_K) \in SFH(-Y(K)) = \widehat{HFK}(-Y,K).$$

In fact, their work was the inspiration for our subsequent definition of $\mathcal{L}_{HM}$. The equivalence below then follows immediately from Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.5. *There is an isomorphism of Λ-modules*

$$\widehat{HFK}(-Y,K) \otimes \Lambda \to \underline{KHM}(-Y,K),$$

sending $\mathcal{L}_{HF}(K) \otimes 1$ to $\mathcal{L}_{HM}(K)$. □

Remark 1.6. The second author defined a similar but different invariant of Legendrian knots in $\underline{KHM}$ in [50]. In fact, it was his construction that inspired our series [3, 4, 5]. It is still unknown how his Legendrian invariant is related to $\mathcal{L}_{HM}$ and therefore to $\mathcal{L}_{HF}$.

A Legendrian invariant is said to be *effective* if it can distinguish smoothly isotopic Legendrian knots with the same classical invariants. The invariant $\mathcal{L}_{HF}$ is effective in that there are Legendrian knots as above for which the invariant vanishes for one but not for the other. Theorem 1.5 then implies that $\mathcal{L}_{HM}$ is effective as well, resolving [5, Conjecture 1.1].

Theorem 1.7. *The invariant $\mathcal{L}_{HM}$ is effective.* □

Remark 1.8. The classes $\mathcal{L}_{HF}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{HM}$ are invariant under negative Legendrian stabilization, and therefore provide invariants of transverse knots as well. Theorem 1.5, combined with computations in Heegaard Floer homology [36], implies that $\mathcal{L}_{HM}$ is an effective transverse invariant knots as well, in the sense that it can distinguish smoothly isotopic transverse knots with the same self-linking numbers.

An even more striking consequence of Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 is that the invariant $\mathcal{L}_{HF}$ is also functorial under Lagrangian concordance, as follows.

Theorem 1.9. *If $K_1, K_2 \subset (Y,\xi)$ are Legendrian with $K_1 \prec K_2$, then there is a map*

$$\widehat{HFK}(-Y,K_2) \otimes \Lambda \to \widehat{HFK}(-Y,K_1) \otimes \Lambda,$$

sending $\mathcal{L}_{HF}(K_2) \otimes 1$ to $\mathcal{L}_{HF}(K_1) \otimes 1$. □

Once again, the value of establishing this functoriality in the Heegaard Floer setting has to do with the relative computability of invariants in that setting. In fact, before the discovery of $\mathcal{L}_{HF}$, Ozsváth, Szabó, and Thurston defined in [47] an (intrinsically) algorithmically computable invariant of Legendrian knots in the tight contact structure (S^3, ξ_{std}) using the

grid diagram formulation of knot Floer homology. Their invariant assigns to a Legendrian $K \subset (S^3, \xi_{std})$ a class

$$\Theta_{HF}(K) \in \widehat{HFK}(-S^3, K).$$

It was shown in [7] that these two Heegaard Floer invariants are equivalent where they overlap, per the following theorem.

Theorem 1.10 (Baldwin–Vela-Vick–Vértesi)**.** *For any Legendrian knot $K \subset (S^3, \xi_{std})$, there is an automorphism*

$$\widehat{HFK}(-S^3, K) \to \widehat{HFK}(-S^3, K),$$

sending $\mathcal{L}_{HF}(K)$ to $\Theta_{HF}(K)$.

Combined with Theorem 1.9, this theorem implies that the invariant $\Theta_{HF} = \mathcal{L}_{HF}$ provides an entirely computable obstruction to the existence of Lagrangian concordances between Legendrian knots in (S^3, ξ_{std}), as follows.

Theorem 1.11. *If K_1 and K_2 are Legendrian knots in (S^3, ξ_{std}) with*

$$\Theta_{HF}(K_1) \neq 0 \text{ and } \Theta_{HF}(K_2) = 0,$$

then there is no Lagrangian concordance from K_1 to K_2. □

As mentioned by the authors of [7], proving a result like Theorem 1.11 was a major part of their motivation for establishing the equivalence described in Theorem 1.10.

It is easy to find examples demonstrating the effectiveness of the obstruction in Theorem 1.11. In particular, there are infinitely many pairs (K_1, K_2) of smoothly isotopic Legendrian knots with the same classical invariants which satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 1.11 [48, 39, 23, 1]. The results of [48] imply that such K_1 and K_2 are not Legendrian isotopic, whereas Theorem 1.11 implies the much stronger fact that K_1 is not Lagrangian concordant to K_2.

It bears mentioning that the Legendrian contact homology DGA of Chekanov and Eliashberg [14] enjoys a similar sort of functoriality under Lagrangian concordance [13]. However, it can be difficult to apply this DGA obstruction in practice. Consider, for example, the two Legendrian representatives K_1 and K_2 of $m(10_{132})$ with $(tb, r) = (1, 0)$ described by Ng, Ozsváth, and Thurston in [39]. One can show that K_1 is not Lagrangian concordant to K_2 by showing that the DGA is trivial for K_2 while nontrivial for K_1. But proving this nontriviality is tricky as the DGA for K_1 does not even admit any nontrivial finite-dimensional representations [51]. By contrast, it is quite easy to check that Θ_{HF} vanishes K_2 but not for K_1, and in so doing, apply the Heegaard Floer obstruction in Theorem 1.11.

Another advantage of Θ_{HF} is that it is preserved under negative Legendrian stabilization, whereas the Legendrian contact homology DGA is trivial for stabilized knots. In particular, for K_1 and K_2 satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 1.11, we may also conclude that no negative stabilization of K_1 is Lagrangian concordant to any negative stabilization of K_2. The DGA, by contrast, cannot tell us anything about Lagrangian concordances between stabilized knots.

In Section 4, we give another demonstration of our obstruction, providing several additional examples of Legendrian knots with the same classical invariants which are not smoothly isotopic or Lagrangian concordant, but which *are smoothly concordant*. In these examples, Lagrangian concordance is obstructed by Theorem 1.11 while the Legendrian contact homology DGA provides no such obstruction.

We next outline our proof of Theorem 1.2, starting with a very brief review of sutured monopole Floer homology and of our contact invariant.

1.3. **Proof outline.** A *closure* of a balanced sutured manifold (M,Γ), as defined by Kronheimer and Mrowka in [27], is a closed manifold Y together with a distinguished surface $R \subset Y$, formed from (M,Γ) in a certain manner, and containing M as a submanifold. The sutured monopole Floer homology of (M,Γ) is defined as the monopole Floer homology of Y in the *bottom* Spin^c structures with respect to R,

$$\underline{SHM}(M,\Gamma) := \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(Y|R;\Gamma_\eta) := \bigoplus_{\langle c_1(\mathfrak{s}),[R]\rangle = 2-2g(R)} \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(Y;\Gamma_\eta),$$

for some curve $\eta \subset R$.[6] Given a sutured contact manifold (M,Γ,ξ), we gave a procedure in [3] for extending ξ to a contact structure $\bar{\xi}$ on a closure (Y,R) with respect to which R is convex and such that

$$\langle c_1(\mathfrak{s}_{\bar{\xi}}), [R]\rangle = 2 - 2g(R).$$

We refer to $(Y,R,\bar{\xi})$ as a *contact closure* of (M,Γ,ξ). We then defined

$$c_{HM}(\xi) := c_{HM}(\bar{\xi}) \in \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y,\mathfrak{s}_{\bar{\xi}};\Gamma_\eta) \subset \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y|-R;\Gamma_\eta) =: \underline{SHM}(-M,-\Gamma),$$

and proved that this class is independent of the myriad choices involved in its construction.

Note that Theorem 1.1 provides an isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} HF^+(-Y|-R;\Gamma_\eta) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y|-R;\Gamma_\eta) & =: & \underline{SHM}(-M,-\Gamma) \\ \cup & & \cup & & \cup \\ c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}) & \longmapsto & c_{HM}(\bar{\xi}) & =: & c_{HM}(\xi). \end{array}$$

Therefore, in order to prove Theorem 1.2, it suffices to establish the following.

Theorem 1.12. *There is an isomorphism of* Λ*-modules*

$$SFH(-M,-\Gamma) \otimes \Lambda \to HF^+(-Y|-R;\Gamma_\eta),$$

sending $c_{HF}(\xi) \otimes 1$ *to* $c_{HF}(\bar{\xi})$.

It bears mentioning that Lekili has already shown in [33] that the modules in Theorem 1.12 are isomorphic. Given a sutured Heegaard diagram for $(-M,-\Gamma)$, Lekili constructs a pointed Heegaard diagram for $-Y$ in a certain natural way, and, by comparing these diagrams, defines a quasi-isomorphism between the corresponding chain complexes. The problem for us is that Lekili's pointed Heegaard diagram has nothing to do with the contact structure $\bar{\xi}$, even if the

[6] In [27] and [6], these sutured Floer homology modules are defined in terms of the *top* Spin^c structures with respect to R; this is not an important difference as the two different choices result in isomorphic modules.

sutured diagram came from a partial open book compatible with ξ, so Lekili's isomorphism says nothing about the relationship between the invariants of ξ and $\bar{\xi}$.

Indeed, a rather more novel approach is required. Our strategy for proving Theorem 1.12 makes use of an interesting topological reformulation of the contact invariant of $\bar{\xi}$. We discovered this reformulation in [3] and used it in [4] to define a contact invariant in instanton Floer homology. One starts with a partial open book for (M, Γ, ξ), which provides a description of this contact manifold as obtained from an $[-1, 1]$-invariant contact structure ξ_S on the product sutured manifold

$$H(S) = (S \times [-1, 1], \partial S \times \{0\})$$

by attaching contact 2-handles along certain curves $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ in $\partial H(S)$. These curves correspond naturally to Legendrians in a contact closure $(Y_S, R, \bar{\xi}_S)$ of $(H(S), \xi_S)$, and we proved that contact $(+1)$-surgery on these Legendrian curves results in a contact closure $(Y, R, \bar{\xi})$ of (M, Γ, ξ). It then follows from the functoriality of the contact invariant under such surgeries [44, Theorem 4.2] that the map

$$G := HF^+(-W|-R; \Gamma_\nu) : HF^+(-Y_S|-R; \Gamma_\eta) \to HF^+(-Y|-R; \Gamma_\eta)$$

induced by the natural 2-handle cobordism (W, ν) from (Y_S, η) to (Y, η) corresponding to these surgeries sends $c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}_S)$ to $c_{HF}(\bar{\xi})$ (up to multiplication by a unit in Λ, a subtlety we will generally ignore). Fortunately,

$$HF^+(-Y_S|-R; \Gamma_\eta) \cong \Lambda = \Lambda\langle c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}_S)\rangle$$

is 1-dimensional, generated by the contact class, so $c_{HF}(\bar{\xi})$ may be characterized more simply as the image of this generator under G. What we actually prove, then, is that there is an isomorphism

$$F : SFH(-M, -\Gamma) \otimes \Lambda \to HF^+(-Y|-R; \Gamma_\eta)$$

sending $c_{HF}(\xi) \otimes 1$ to $G(c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}_S))$, as shown in the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & SFH(-M,-\Gamma)\otimes\Lambda & \ni & c_{HF}(\xi)\otimes 1 \\
 & & \cong\big\downarrow F & & \big\downarrow \\
\Lambda\langle c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}_S)\rangle \cong HF^+(-Y_S|-R;\Gamma_\eta) & \xrightarrow[G]{} & HF^+(-Y|-R;\Gamma_\eta) & & \\
\cup & & & \ni & \\
c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}_S) & \longmapsto & & & G(c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}_S)) = c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}).
\end{array}$$

Since $G(c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}_S)) = c_{HF}(\bar{\xi})$, this proves Theorem 1.12 and, therefore, Theorem 1.2.

A few further remarks are in order about our proof. First, the map F is induced by a natural map from the Floer complex associated with a sutured diagram for $(-M, -\Gamma)$ to the Floer complex associated with a pointed Heegaard diagram for $-Y$ that is similar to, but slightly different from, the sort of diagram Lekili considers. A novel aspect of our construction is that, for $g(R)$ sufficiently large and for sufficient *winding* of the curves in the Heegaard diagram, we are able to show that this map is a chain map and a quasi-isomorphism without resorting to the somewhat involved holomorphic curve analysis that appears in Lekili's proof.

Second, the map G is induced by a chain map defined by counting holomorphic triangles in a pointed Heegaard triple diagram. Our proof that the map F sends $c_{HF}(\xi)\otimes 1$ to $G(c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}_S))$ is ultimately achieved by showing that, for $g(R)$ sufficiently large and sufficient winding, these triangle counts correspond to much simpler triangle counts in a related sutured triple diagram which encodes the sutured cobordism from $-H(S)$ to $(-M,-\Gamma)$ corresponding to the contact 2-handle attachments along the curves $s_1,\dots,s_n$.

1.4. **Future applications.** Our method of proof may also have interesting applications outside of contact geometry. In particular, we strongly suspect that our techniques may be used to show that more general holomorphic polygon counts in sutured multidiagrams can be made to correspond precisely with holomorphic polygon counts in pointed Heegaard multidiagrams associated to closures of the relevant sutured manifolds, so long as one takes closures with $g(R)$ sufficiently large. This sort of higher polygon counting is frequently used to construct exact triangles in the Heegaard Floer setting. An important example is Manolescu's unoriented skein exact triangle in Heegaard knot Floer homology, which is defined by counting holomorphic polygons in a sutured multidiagram [37]. An extension of our work here ought to then provide an alternative construction of Manolescu's triangle, using instead a pointed Heegaard multidiagram for closures of the sutured manifolds (knot complements) involved in the triangle.

Our interest in this alternative construction of Manolescu's triangle has to do with defining an analogous skein triangle in monopole knot Floer homology—a theory defined, after all, in terms of closures. Exact triangles in the monopole Floer setting are typically defined in terms of counts of monopoles over cobordisms equipped with families of metrics. A construction of Manolescu's triangle via pointed Heegaard multidiagrams for closures would tell us which cobordisms and families of metrics to use in defining the analogous skein triangle in monopole knot Floer homology (a multidiagram specifies a cobordism and embedded hypersurfaces along which to stretch the metric). An interesting goal would then be to iterate this triangle to give a combinatorial description of monopole knot Floer homology, following the ideas in [2], and to use this description to give another proof that Heegaard knot Floer homology is isomorphic to monopole knot Floer homology, circumventing the difficult analysis of Taubes et al.

1.5. **Organization.** In Section 2, we provide a basic review of the constructions and properties of the contact invariants in Heegaard and monopole Floer homologies and their sutured variants. Then, in Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.12 and therefore our main Theorem 1.2, as outlined above. Finally, in Section 4, we give examples further illustrating the effectiveness of Theorem 1.11.

1.6. **Acknowledgements.** We thank Ko Honda for helpful correspondence.

2. Background

2.1. **Monopole Floer homology and contact invariants.** We start by recalling some basic features of monopole Floer homology and of Kronheimer and Mrowka's contact invariant for closed contact 3-manifolds defined therein.

Let Λ be the Novikov ring over $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ defined by

$$\Lambda = \left\{ \sum_{\alpha} c_\alpha t^\alpha \;\middle|\; \alpha \in \mathbb{R},\ c_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z},\ \#\{\beta < n | c_\beta \neq 0\} < \infty \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$

Suppose Y is a closed, oriented 3-manifold and η is a smooth 1-cycle in Y. Kronheimer and Mrowka defined in [26, 27] a version of monopole Floer homology with local coefficients which assigns to the pair (Y, η) a $\Lambda[U]$-module

$$\widetilde{HM}_\bullet(Y; \Gamma_\eta) = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{s} \in \mathrm{Spin}^c(Y)} \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(Y, \mathfrak{s}; \Gamma_\eta).$$

Their assignment is functorial in that a smooth cobordism (W, ν) from (Y_1, η_1) to (Y_2, η_2) gives rise to a map of $\Lambda[U]$-modules,

$$\widetilde{HM}_\bullet(W; \Gamma_\nu) : \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(Y_1; \Gamma_{\eta_1}) \to \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(Y_2; \Gamma_{\eta_2}),$$

where these maps compose in the obvious way. To a pair (Y, η) and a contact structure ξ on Y, Kronheimer and Mrowka assign in [24, 25] an element

$$c_{HM}(\xi) \in \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y, \mathfrak{s}_\xi; \Gamma_\eta) \subset \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y; \Gamma_\eta)^7$$

which depends only on the isotopy class of ξ. One of the most important properties of this invariant is its functoriality with respect to contact $(+1)$-surgery, per the following.[8]

Theorem 2.1 (Hutchings–Taubes)**.** *Suppose (Y', ξ') is the result of contact $(+1)$-surgery on a Legendrian knot $K \subset (Y, \xi)$ disjoint from η. Let W be the corresponding 2-handle cobordism, obtained from $Y \times [0,1]$ by attaching a contact $(+1)$-framed 2-handle along $K \times \{1\}$, and let $\nu \subset W$ be the cylinder $\nu = \eta \times [0,1]$. The induced map*

$$\widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-W; \Gamma_\nu) : \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y; \Gamma_\eta) \to \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y'; \Gamma_\eta)$$

sends $c_{HM}(\xi)$ to $c_{HM}(\xi')$, up to multiplication by a unit in Λ (a subtlety we will generally ignore).

Remark 2.2. This theorem is a special case of a more general functoriality result for the contact invariant with respect to maps induced by exact symplectic cobordisms, as established by Hutchings and Taubes in [20] (cf. also Mrowka–Rollin [38]). This more general result was used to prove Theorem 1.4, as mentioned in the introduction.

2.2. **Sutured monopole Floer homology and contact invariants.** We now recall the definition of sutured monopole Floer homology and our construction of the contact invariant for sutured contact manifolds defined therein.

Suppose (M, Γ) is a balanced sutured manifold. Let $A(\Gamma)$ be a closed tubular neighborhood of Γ, and let T be a compact, connected, oriented surface with $g(T) \geq 2$ and $\pi_0(\partial T) \cong \pi_0(\Gamma)$. Let

$$h : \partial T \times [-1, 1] \to A(\Gamma)$$

[7] As mentioned in the introduction, this class is denoted by $\psi(\xi)$ in [25].

[8] This theorem was originally stated with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, but the proof works in the setting of local coefficients just as well.

be an orientation-reversing homeomorphism sending $\partial T \times \{\pm 1\}$ to $\partial(R_\pm \setminus A(\Gamma))$. Now consider the *preclosure*

$$P = M \cup_h F \times [-1,1]$$

formed by gluing $F \times [-1,1]$ according to h. The balanced condition ensures that P has two homeomorphic boundary components, $\partial_+ P$ and $\partial_- P$, given by

$$\partial_\pm P = R_\pm(\Gamma) \cup T \times \{\pm 1\}.$$

One can then glue $\partial_+ P$ to $\partial_- P$ by an orientation-reversing homeomorphism to form a closed, oriented 3-manifold Y containing a distinguished surface

$$R := \partial_+ P = -\partial_- P \subset Y.$$

In [27], Kronheimer and Mrowka define a *closure* of (M,Γ) to be any pair (Y,R) obtained in this manner. We refer to T as the *auxiliary surface* used to form this closure.

Remark 2.3. If (Y,R) is a closure of (M,Γ), then $(-Y,-R)$ is a closure of $(-M,-\Gamma)$.

Remark 2.4. It is sometimes helpful to think of Y as obtained by gluing $R \times [-1,1]$ to P, by a map which identifies $R \times \{\pm 1\}$ with $\partial_\mp P$, and R as $R \times \{0\}$. In particular, from this perspective, ∂M is a submanifold of Y.

Suppose (Y,R) is a closure of (M,Γ) as above, and fix an oriented curve $\eta \subset R$ which is dual to a homologically essential curve in the auxiliary surface T. The sutured monopole Floer homology of (M,Γ) is defined to be the Λ-module

$$\underline{SHM}(M,\Gamma) := \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(Y|R;\Gamma_\eta) := \bigoplus_{\langle c_1(\mathfrak{s}),[R]\rangle = 2-2g(R)} \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(Y;\Gamma_\eta).^9$$

Indeed, Kronheimer and Mrowka prove in [27] that the isomorphism class of this module is independent of the choice of closure (Y,R) and curve η, and is therefore an invariant of (M,Γ).

Now suppose (M,Γ,ξ) is a sutured contact manifold; that is, ∂M is convex and Γ divides the characteristic foliation of ξ on ∂M. In [3], we gave a procedure for extending ξ first to a contact structure ξ' on P, and then to a contact structure $\bar{\xi}$ on a closure (Y,R) of (M,Γ), such that R is convex with respect to $\bar{\xi}$ with

$$\langle c_1(\mathfrak{s}_{\bar{\xi}}), [R]\rangle_Y = 2 - 2g(R).$$

We refer to $(Y,R,\bar{\xi})$ as a *contact closure* of (M,Γ,ξ). The above pairing implies that

$$\langle c_1(\mathfrak{s}_{\bar{\xi}}), [-R]\rangle_{-Y} = 2 - 2g(R).$$

It therefore makes sense to define the element

$$c_{HM}(\xi) := c_{HM}(\bar{\xi}) \in \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y, \mathfrak{s}_{\bar{\xi}}; \Gamma_\eta) \subset \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y|-R;\Gamma_\eta) =: \underline{SHM}(-M,-\Gamma).$$

We showed in [3] that, for a certain subclass of curves $\eta \subset R$ satisfying the constraints above, this element is independent of the choices involved in its construction. Below, we describe an alternate, explicit means of defining this invariant using partial open books.

[9] Technically, Kronheimer and Mrowka consider instead those $\mathfrak{s}$ with $\langle c_1(\mathfrak{s}),[R]\rangle = 2g(R)-2$. Our convention is better suited to the contact perspective and changes nothing of import. In particular, the two conventions result in isomorphic Λ-modules.

Following [3, Definition 4.9], a *partial open book* is a quadruple $(S, P, h, \mathbf{c})$, where:

- S is a surface with nonempty boundary,
- P is a subsurface of S,
- $h : P \to S$ is an embedding which restricts to the identity on $\partial P \cap \partial S$,
- $\{c_1, \ldots, c_n\}$ is a set of disjoint, properly embedded arcs in P whose complement in S deformation retracts onto $S \smallsetminus P$.

Given such a partial open book, let ξ_S be the $[-1,1]$-invariant contact structure on $S \times [-1,1]$ for which each $S \times \{t\}$ is convex with Legendrian boundary and dividing set consisting of one boundary-parallel arc for each component of ∂S, oriented in the direction of ∂S. Let $H(S)$ be the sutured contact manifold obtained from $(S \times [-1,1], \xi_S)$ by rounding corners, as illustrated in Figure 1 below. In particular, the dividing set on $\partial H(S)$ is isotopic to $\partial S \times \{0\}$. Let s_i be the curve on $\partial H(S)$ given by

$$s_i = (c_i \times \{1\}) \cup (\partial c_i \times [-1,1]) \cup (h(c_i) \times \{-1\}).^{10}$$

We say that $(S, P, h, \{c_1, \ldots, c_n\})$ is *compatible* with the sutured contact manifold (M, Γ, ξ) if the latter can be obtained from $H(S)$ by attaching contact 2-handles along the curves $s_1, \ldots, s_n$. Honda, Kazez, and Matić proved the following in [19].

Theorem 2.5 (Honda–Kazez–Matić)**.** *Every sutured contact manifold admits a compatible partial open book decomposition.*



FIGURE 1. Left, $(S \times [-1,1], \xi_S)$, with negative region shaded, for a genus 2 surface with 3 boundary components. Right, the convex boundary of the sutured contact manifold $H(S)$ obtained by rounding corners.

Suppose now that (M, Γ, ξ) is a sutured contact manifold and that $(S, P, h, \{c_1, \ldots, c_n\})$ is a compatible partial open book. Suppose $(Y_S, R, \bar{\xi}_S)$ is a contact closure of $H(S)$. Adopting the perspective of Remark 2.4, we may view $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ as embedded curves in Y_S disjoint from R. After small perturbation, we may assume that each s_i is Legendrian with respect to $\bar{\xi}_S$ (via the Legendrian Realization Principle [22, 18]). In [3], we proved that the result of contact

[10] In a slight abuse of notation, we will simply identify $H(S)$ with $(S \times [-1,1], \xi_S)$, ignoring corner rounding.

(+1)-surgeries on these Legendrians is a contact closure $(Y, R, \bar{\xi})$ of (M, Γ, ξ). For a certain class of curves $\eta \subset R$, we showed that

$$\underline{SHM}(-H(S)) := \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y_S|-R;\Gamma_\eta) \cong \Lambda \tag{2}$$

is generated by the contact class $c_{HM}(\xi_S) := c_{HM}(\bar{\xi}_S)$. Let W be the 2-handle cobordism from Y_S to Y corresponding to the above surgeries on $s_1, \dots, s_n$. Since $R \subset Y_S$ and $R \subset Y$ are homologous in W (these two copies of R are the boundary components of a properly embedded $R \times [-1,1] \subset W$), the cobordism map in Theorem 2.1 restricts to a map

$$\widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-W|-R;\Gamma_\nu) : \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y_S|-R;\Gamma_\eta) \to \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y|-R;\Gamma_\eta) =: \underline{SHM}(-M,-\Gamma), \tag{3}$$

obtained as the sum of the maps

$$\widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-W,\mathfrak{t};\Gamma_\nu) : \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y_S,\mathfrak{t}|_{-Y_S};\Gamma_\eta) \to \widetilde{HM}_\bullet(-Y,\mathfrak{t}|_{-Y};\Gamma_\eta)$$

over Spin^c structures $\mathfrak{t}$ on $-W$ for which

$$\langle c_1(\mathfrak{t}), [-R] \rangle = 2 - 2g(R).$$

By Theorem 2.1, this restriction map then sends the generator $c_{HM}(\bar{\xi}_S)$ to the class $c_{HM}(\bar{\xi}) =: c_{HM}(\xi)$ (again, up to multiplication by a unit in Λ). In other words, the invariant $c_{HF}(\xi)$ is simply the image of the generator of (2) under the cobordism map in (3). This formulation will be critical in our proof of Theorem 1.2.

2.3. **Sutured Heegaard Floer homology and contact invariants.** Below, we recall the definition of sutured Heegaard Floer homology and Honda, Kazez, and Matić's construction of the contact invariant defined therein.

To define the sutured Heegaard Floer homology of a balanced sutured manifold (M, Γ), as introduced by Juhász in [21], one starts with an admissible sutured Heegaard diagram

$$(\Sigma, \alpha = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}, \beta = \{\beta_1 \dots, \beta_n\})$$

for (M, Γ). In particular,

- Σ is a compact surface with boundary,
- M is obtained from $\Sigma \times [-1,1]$ by attaching 3-dimensional 2-handles along the curves $\alpha_i \times \{-1\}$ and $\beta_i \times \{1\}$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and
- Γ is given by $\partial\Sigma \times \{0\}$.

The sutured Heegaard Floer complex

$$CF(\alpha, \beta) := CF(\Sigma, \alpha, \beta)$$

is the $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ vector space generated by intersection points

$$\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}_\alpha \cap \mathbb{T}_\beta = (\alpha_1 \times \cdots \times \alpha_n) \cap (\beta_1 \times \cdots \times \beta_n) \subset \mathrm{Sym}^n(\Sigma).$$

The differential is defined by counting holomorphic disks in the usual way; namely, for a generator $\mathbf{x}$ as above,

$$d\mathbf{x} = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{T}_\alpha \cap \mathbb{T}_\beta} \sum_{\substack{\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \\ \mu(\phi) = 1}} \#\big(\mathcal{M}(\phi)/\mathbb{R}\big) \cdot \mathbf{y},$$

where $\pi_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is the set of homotopy classes of Whitney disks from $\mathbf{x}$ to $\mathbf{y}$; $\mu(\phi)$ refers to the Maslov index of ϕ; and $\mathcal{M}(\phi)$ is the moduli space of pseudoholomorphic representatives of ϕ. The sutured Heegaard Floer homology of (M, Γ) is the homology

$$SFH(M, \Gamma) := H_*(CF(\Sigma, \alpha, \beta), d)$$

of this complex.

Suppose now that (M, Γ, ξ) is a sutured contact manifold and that $(S, P, h, \{c_1, \dots, c_n\})$ is a compatible partial open book. Let Σ be the surface formed by attaching 1-handles $H_1, \dots, H_n$ to S, where the feet of H_i are attached along the endpoints of c_i. Orient Σ so that the induced orientation on S as a subsurface of Σ is opposite the given orientation on S. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let α_i and β_i be embedded curves in Σ such that:

- α_i is the union of c_i with a core of H_i, and
- β_i is the union of $h(c_i)$ with a core of H_i.

We require that these curves intersect in the region $H_i \subset \Sigma$ in the manner shown in Figure 2. Then (Σ, β, α) is an admissible sutured Heegaard diagram for $(-M, -\Gamma)$, as shown in [19]. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let c^i be the unique intersection point between α_i and β_i in H_i, and define

$$\mathbf{c} = \{c^1, \dots, c^n\} \in \mathbb{T}_\beta \cap \mathbb{T}_\alpha \subset \mathrm{Sym}^n(\Sigma). \tag{4}$$

In [19], the contact invariant $c_{HF}(\xi)$ is given by

$$c_{HF}(\xi) := [\mathbf{c}] \in SFH(-M, -\Gamma).$$



FIGURE 2. The handle H_i, the curves α_i and β_i, and the intersection point c^i.

2.4. **Heegaard Floer homology with local coefficients and contact invariants.** Finally, we recall the definition of Heegaard Floer homology with local coefficients and we review the construction of Ozsváth and Szabó's contact invariant for closed manifolds therein.

Suppose Y is a closed, oriented 3-manifold, and η is an oriented, embedded curve in Y. To define the Heegaard Floer homology of Y with local coefficient system associated with η, one starts with an admissible pointed Heegaard diagram

$$(\Sigma, \alpha = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}, \beta = \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, z)$$

for Y. We may view η as a (possibly non-embedded) curve on Σ. The chain complex

$$CF^+(\alpha, \beta; \Gamma_\eta) := CF^+(\Sigma, \alpha, \beta, z; \Gamma_\eta)$$

is the $\Lambda[U]$-module

$$\bigoplus_{\mathbf{x}\in T_\alpha\cap T_\beta}\left(\frac{\Lambda[U,U^{-1}]}{U\cdot\Lambda[U]}\right)\langle\mathbf{x}\rangle,$$

generated by intersection points $\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{T}_\alpha\cap\mathbb{T}_\beta$. For ease of notation, we will adopt the convention in [43] and use $[\mathbf{x},i]$ to denote $U^{-i}\mathbf{x}$, which then vanishes for $i<0$. The differential is defined on such a pair by

$$\partial^+([\mathbf{x},i])=\sum_{\substack{\phi\in\pi_2(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})\\ \mu(\phi)=1}}\#\big(\mathcal{M}(\phi)/\mathbb{R}\big)\cdot[\mathbf{y},i-n_z(\phi)]\cdot t^{\partial_\alpha(\phi)\cdot\eta},$$

and extended linearly with respect to multiplication in Λ. Here, $\partial_\alpha(\phi)\cdot\eta$ refers to the oriented intersection in Σ of the α portion of the boundary of the domain of ϕ in Σ with the curve η. The Heegaard Floer homology of Y is the homology

$$HF^+(Y;\Gamma_\eta):=H_*(CF^+(\alpha,\beta;\Gamma_\eta),\partial^+)$$

of this complex. The homology is, up to isomorphism of $\Lambda[U]$-modules, an invariant of the class $[\eta]\in H_1(Y;\mathbb{Z})$.

Suppose now that (Y,ξ) is a closed contact 3-manifold with embedded curve η. Its contact invariant, originally defined by Ozsváth and Szabó in [44] in terms of compatible (non-partial) open books, may also be described as follows. Let $(S,P,h,\{c_1,\dots,c_n\})$ be a partial open book for the sutured contact manifold $(Y(1),\xi(1))$ obtained from (Y,ξ) by removing a Darboux ball. Let (Σ,β,α) be the corresponding sutured Heegaard diagram for $-Y(1)$. Note that Σ has a single boundary component. Let Σ' be the closed surface obtained by capping off this component with a disk containing a point z. Then (Σ',β,α,z) is an admissible pointed Heegaard diagram for $-Y$. It follows from Honda, Kazez, and Matić's work in [19] that Ozsváth and Szabó's contact invariant is given by

$$c_{HF}(\xi)=[[\mathbf{c},0]]\in HF^+(-Y;\Gamma_\eta),$$

where $\mathbf{c}\in\mathbb{T}_\beta\cap\mathbb{T}_\alpha$ is the intersection point defined in (4). This invariant enjoys the same sort of functoriality under contact $(+1)$-surgery as Kronheimer and Mrowka's contact invariant in monopole Floer homology, per the following.[11]

Theorem 2.6 (Ozsváth–Szabó)**.** *Suppose (Y',ξ') is the result of contact $(+1)$-surgery on a Legendrian knot $K\subset(Y,\xi)$ disjoint from η. Let W be the corresponding 2-handle cobordism, obtained from $Y\times[0,1]$ by attaching a contact $(+1)$-framed 2-handle along $K\times\{1\}$, and let $\nu\subset W$ be the cylinder $\nu=\eta\times[0,1]$. The induced map*

$$HF^+(-W;\Gamma_\nu):HF^+(-Y;\Gamma_\eta)\to HF^+(-Y';\Gamma_\eta)$$

sends $c_{HF}(\xi)$ to $c_{HF}(\xi')$.

As we will need to study these sorts of cobordism maps in depth, we recall here the definition of the map in Theorem 2.6 in the setting of local coefficients.

[11] As in the monopole Floer case, this theorem was originally stated with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, but the proof works in the setting of local coefficients just as well.

Let $(\Sigma, \gamma, \beta, \alpha, z)$ be an admissible pointed Heegaard triple diagram for the cobordism $-W$, left-subordinate to the contact $(+1)$-framed knot $K \subset -Y$, as in [45, Section 5.2]. In particular, $Y_{\gamma,\beta}$ is a connected sum of copies of $S^1 \times S^2$, $Y_{\beta,\alpha} = -Y$, and $Y_{\gamma,\alpha} = -Y'$. Let $\Theta \in \mathbb{T}_\gamma \cap \mathbb{T}_\beta$ denote the intersection point in top Maslov grading. Then the map

$$HF^+(-W; \Gamma_\nu) : HF^+(-Y; \Gamma_\eta) \to HF^+(-Y'; \Gamma_\eta)$$

is induced by the chain map

$$f^+_{\gamma,\beta,\alpha;\Gamma_\nu} : CF^+(\beta, \alpha; \Gamma_\eta) \to CF^+(\gamma, \alpha; \Gamma_\eta),$$

defined on $[\mathbf{x}, i]$ by

$$f^+_{\gamma,\beta,\alpha;\Gamma_\nu}([\mathbf{x}, i]) = \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{T}_\gamma \cap \mathbb{T}_\alpha} \sum_{\substack{\phi \in \pi_2(\Theta, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \\ \mu(\phi) = 0}} \#\mathcal{M}(\phi) \cdot [\mathbf{y}, i - n_z(\phi)] \cdot t^{\partial_\alpha(\phi) \cdot \eta},$$

where $\pi_2(\Theta, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is the set of homotopy classes of Whitney triangles with vertices at $\Theta, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$, and $\mathcal{M}(\phi)$ is the moduli space of holomorphic representatives of ϕ. This map is an invariant of the class $[\nu] \in H_2(-W, -\partial W; \mathbb{Z})$.

3. Proof of Main Theorem

Suppose (M, Γ, ξ) is a sutured contact manifold. The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.12 of the introduction, a more precise version of which is stated below. The Main Theorem of this paper, Theorem 1.2, then follows immediately, as explained in the introduction.

Theorem 1.12. *There exists a contact closure $(Y, R, \bar{\xi})$ of (M, Γ, ξ) with an oriented curve $\eta \subset R$ which is dual to an essential curve in the associated auxiliary surface T, for which there is an isomorphism of Λ-modules*

$$F : SFH(-M, -\Gamma) \otimes \Lambda \to HF^+(-Y|-R; \Gamma_\eta),$$

sending $c_{HF}(\xi) \otimes 1$ to $c_{HF}(\bar{\xi})$.

We prove Theorem 1.12 according to the strategy outlined in the introduction. In particular, as we show in Subsection 3.4, Theorem 1.12 follows from Theorems 3.4 and 3.5.

3.1. Heegaard diagrams for closures and cobordisms.

Fix a partial open book

$$(S, P, h, \{c_1, \ldots, c_n\})$$

compatible with (M, Γ, ξ). Recall that an important ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.12 involves understanding the map (denoted in the introduction by G) induced by $-W$, where W is the 2-handle cobordism from a closure of $H(S)$ to a closure of (M, Γ), corresponding to surgery on the $\partial H(S)$-framed curves

$$s_i = (c_i \times \{1\}) \cup (\partial c_i \times [-1, 1]) \cup (h(c_i) \times \{-1\}) \subset \partial(S \times [-1, 1]) \tag{5}$$

in the closure of $H(S)$. In order to eventually understand this map (see Theorem 3.4), we first describe a pointed Heegaard triple diagram for the cobordism $-W$.

Let Σ be the surface formed by attaching 1-handles $H_1, \ldots, H_n$ and $H'_1, \ldots, H'_n$ to S, where:

- the feet of H_i are attached along the endpoints of c_i,
- the feet of H_i' are attached along the endpoints of a cocore of H_i.

We orient Σ so that the induced orientation on S as a subsurface of Σ is opposite the given orientation on S. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i$ be embedded curves in Σ such that:

- α_i is the union of c_i with a core of H_i,
- β_i is the union of a cocore of H_i with a core of H_i',
- γ_i is the union of $h(c_i)$ with a core of H_i.

We require that these curves intersect in the region $H_i \subset \Sigma$ in the manner shown on the right in Figure 3.



FIGURE 3. On the left, a portion of S near c_i. In the middle, the corresponding portion of Σ with the curves $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i$. On the right, a closeup of these curves in H_i. We have labeled the intersection points $\Theta^i, c_\beta^i, c_\gamma^i$, the points $w_i^\pm$, and have shaded the triangle Δ^i.

Remark 3.1. Note that the sutured Heegaard diagram

$$(\Sigma, \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \tag{6}$$

is an n-fold stabilization of the standard diagram for $-H(S)$. Meanwhile, the sutured Heegaard diagram

$$(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \tag{7}$$

is obtained from the standard Heegaard diagram for $(-M, -\Gamma)$ associated with the partial open book $(S, P, h, \{c_1, \dots, c_n\})$, as described in Subsection 2.3, by attaching the handles $H_1', \dots, H_n'$. In particular, it is a sutured Heegaard diagram for the sutured manifold obtained from $(-M, -\Gamma)$ by attaching n contact 1-handles. We will generally ignore this difference, however, and simply think of the diagram in (7) as encoding $(-M, -\Gamma)$ since (1) there is a canonical isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} H_*(SFC(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\})) &\cong H_*(SFC(\Sigma \smallsetminus (\cup_i H_i'), \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\})) \\ &=: SFH(-M, -\Gamma), \end{aligned}$$

and (2) a contact closure of a sutured manifold obtained from $(-M, -\Gamma)$ via contact 1-handle attachments is also a contact closure of $(-M, -\Gamma)$, as explained in [3].

We now describe a Heegaard triple diagram which encodes closures of the sutured manifolds specified by the diagrams in (6) and (7) as well as the cobordism $-W$. Let T be a compact, oriented, connected surface with boundary and $g(T) \geq 2$, such that

$$\pi_0(\partial T) \cong \pi_0(\partial \Sigma) \cong \pi_0(\partial S).$$

Let R_S be the closed, oriented surface formed by gluing T to S by a diffeomorphism of their boundaries. Let R_Σ be the surface formed by gluing T to Σ in a similar manner. Let D_a and D_b be two disjoint disks in T. Let $\underline{R}_S$ and $\underline{R}_\Sigma$ denote the complements of these disks in R_S and R_Σ,

$$\underline{R}_S = R_S \smallsetminus D_a \smallsetminus D_b,$$
$$\underline{R}_\Sigma = R_\Sigma \smallsetminus D_a \smallsetminus D_b,$$

and let

$$\underline{\Sigma} = \underline{R}_S \cup \underline{R}_\Sigma$$

be the closed surface formed by gluing these complements together by the identity maps on ∂D_a and ∂D_b. In other words, $\underline{\Sigma}$ is obtained by connecting R_S and R_Σ via two tubes. We will think of the $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i$ curves above as lying in $\underline{R}_\Sigma \subset \underline{\Sigma}$. See the middle diagram in Figure 4 for an illustration of $\underline{\Sigma} = \underline{R}_S \cup \underline{R}_\Sigma$ in the case that S is an annulus, h is a right-handed Dehn twist around the core, $\{c_1, \ldots, c_n\}$ consists of just the cocore, and T is a genus 2 surface with 2 boundary components.

Suppose R_S has genus g. Then R_Σ and $\underline{\Sigma}$ have genera $n+g$ and $n+2g+1$, respectively. Let

$$\{a_{n+1}, \ldots, a_{n+2g}\} \text{ and } \{b_{n+1}, \ldots, b_{n+2g}\} \tag{8}$$

be the sets of pairwise disjoint, properly embedded arcs in $\underline{R}_S$ shown in Figure 5. In particular, the two sets of arcs are related by rotation of the surface by 180° around the axis shown in the figure. We index the arcs so that each a_i intersects b_i in exactly one place and is disjoint from b_j for $j \neq i$. Note that the a_i have endpoints on ∂D_b and cut $\underline{R}_S$ into an annulus with ∂D_a as a boundary component. Likewise, the b_j have endpoints on ∂D_a and cut $\underline{R}_S$ into an annulus with ∂D_b as a boundary component.

Observe that the regular neighborhoods

$$U_i = N(\alpha_i \cup \beta_i) \subset \Sigma,$$
$$V_i = N(\beta_i \cup \gamma_i) \subset \Sigma$$

are once-punctured tori. In particular, there exist disks $D_1, \ldots, D_n \subset S$ such that

$$\underline{R}_S \smallsetminus (\cup_{i=1}^n D_i) \cong \underline{R}_\Sigma \smallsetminus (\cup_{i=1}^n U_i) \cong \underline{R}_\Sigma \smallsetminus (\cup_{i=1}^n V_i). \tag{9}$$

We may assume that these D_i, as disks in $\underline{R}_S$, are disjoint from the arcs in (8). Let

$$\varphi_\alpha : \underline{R}_S \smallsetminus (\cup_{i=1}^n D_i) \to \underline{R}_\Sigma \smallsetminus (\cup_{i=1}^n U_i),$$
$$\varphi_\gamma : \underline{R}_S \smallsetminus (\cup_{i=1}^n D_i) \to \underline{R}_\Sigma \smallsetminus (\cup_{i=1}^n V_i)$$



FIGURE 4. Top left, the annulus S with basis arc c_1 and its image under the right-handed Dehn twist around the core (it looks like a left-handed Dehn twist because we reverse the orientation of S in forming Σ). Top middle and right, Σ and the curves $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1$. Middle, the corresponding surface $\underline{\Sigma} = \underline{R}_\Sigma \cup \underline{R}_S$. Bottom, the triple diagram $(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \beta, \alpha)$ without the curves $\gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_8$, which are just small Hamiltonian translates of $\beta_2, \dots, \beta_8$.

be diffeomorphisms which restricts to the identity map on $T \setminus D_a \setminus D_b$. For $i = n{+}1, \dots, n{+}2g$, let α_i, β_i be the curves in $\underline{\Sigma} = \underline{R}_S \cup \underline{R}_\Sigma$ given by

$$\alpha_i = a_i \cup \varphi_\alpha(a_i),$$
$$\beta_i = b_i \cup \varphi_\gamma(b_i).$$



FIGURE 5. The arcs a_i, b_j on $\underline{R}_S$. The arc b_i is the image of a_i under rotation of 180° about the axis A.

Let

$$\alpha_{n+2g+1} = \partial D_a \subset \underline{\Sigma},$$
$$\beta_{n+2g+1} = \partial D_b \subset \underline{\Sigma}.$$

For $i = n+1, \ldots, n+2g+1$, let γ_i be a small Hamiltonian translate of β_i in $\underline{\Sigma}$ such that β_i and γ_i intersect in exactly two points, both contained in $\underline{R}_S \subset \underline{\Sigma}$. See Figure 6 for a closeup near the intersections of the curves $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i$, for $i = n+1, \ldots, n+2g$, on $\underline{R}_S \subset \underline{\Sigma}$.



FIGURE 6. Intersections of the $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i$ curves for $i = n+1, \ldots, n+2g$. The figures on the left and right show the same curves, after rotating this portion of $\underline{R}_S$ by 180° about the axis A of Figure 5. Left, we have labeled the intersection points $\Theta^i, x^i_\beta, x^i_\gamma$ and shaded the triangle Δ^i; likewise for $\Theta^j, x^j_\beta, x^j_\gamma, \Delta^j$ on the right.

Let

$$\alpha = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n+2g+1}\},$$
$$\beta = \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n+2g+1}\},$$
$$\gamma = \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n+2g+1}\}.$$

We claim the following:

- $(\underline{\Sigma}, \beta, \alpha)$ is a Heegaard diagram for a closure $Y_\beta =: -Y_S$ of $-H(S)$,
- $(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \alpha)$ is a Heegaard diagram for a closure $Y_\gamma =: -Y$ of $(-M, -\Gamma)$,
- $(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \beta, \alpha)$ is a Heegaard triple diagram for the cobordism $W_{\beta,\gamma} =: -W : -Y_S \to -Y$, where $W : Y_S \to Y$ is the 2-handle cobordism corresponding to surgery on the $s_i \subset \partial H(S) \subset Y_S$.

These claims will be unsurprising to the expert. These sorts of Heegaard diagrams for closures are used in Lekili's work [33] and are very similar to those in Ozsváth-Szabó's work [44, Section 3]. Nevertheless, we provide an explanation below. We will explain the first of these Heegaard diagrams in depth; the claim regarding the second admits a similar explanation. We will then address the third claim, regarding the Heegaard triple diagram for the cobordism.

Recall from Remark 3.1 that

$$(\Sigma, \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\})$$

is a Heegaard diagram for the sutured manifold $-H(S)$. It follows that

$$(R_\Sigma, \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\})$$

specifies the preclosure P obtained from $-H(S)$ by attaching $T \times [-1, 1]$ in the usual way. That is, P is obtained from $R_\Sigma \times [-1, 1]$ by attaching thickened disks to $R_\Sigma \times \{-1\}$ along $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ and to $R_\Sigma \times \{1\}$ along $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$. Let us denote these unions of thickened disks by C_β and C_α, respectively, so that

$$P = R_\Sigma \times [-1, 1] \cup C_\beta \cup C_\alpha.$$

The boundary of P consists of two homeomorphic components, $\partial P = \partial_+ P \sqcup -\partial_- P$. Let

$$R_\beta := \partial_+ P.$$

Per Remark 2.4, one may form a closure $Y_\beta =: -Y_S$ of $-H(S)$ by gluing $R_\beta \times [-1, 1]$ to P, and one may do so in such a way that

- $D_a \times \{\mp 1\} \subset R_\beta \times \{\mp 1\}$ is identified with $D_a \times \{\pm 1\} \subset \partial_\pm P$, and
- $D_b \times \{\mp 1\} \subset R_\beta \times \{\mp 1\}$ is identified with $D_b \times \{\pm 1\} \subset \partial_\pm P$.

The distinguished surface may be identified with $R_\beta =: -R$. The diagram on the left in Figure 7 is a schematic illustration of this closure. Note that the disjoint union $R_\Sigma \times \{0\} \sqcup R_\beta \times \{0\}$ separates Y_β into two pieces V_β and V_α, containing C_β and C_α, respectively. Let T_β and T_α be the tubes in V_α and V_β, respectively, defined by

$$T_\beta = (D_b \times [0, 1] \subset R_\Sigma \times [0, 1]) \cup (D_b \times [-1, 0] \subset R_\beta \times [-1, 0]),$$
$$T_\alpha = (D_a \times [-1, 0] \subset R_\Sigma \times [-1, 0]) \cup (D_a \times [0, 1] \subset R_\beta \times [0, 1]).$$

Then the handlebodies

$$H_\beta = \overline{V_\beta \smallsetminus T_\alpha} \cup T_\beta,$$
$$H_\alpha = \overline{V_\alpha \smallsetminus T_\beta} \cup T_\alpha$$

provide a Heegaard splitting of Y_β, as indicated in the diagram on the right in Figure 7. The Heegaard surface in this splitting is therefore obtained by connecting $R_\Sigma \times \{0\}$ and $R_\beta \times \{0\}$ via two tubes. In particular, since $R_\beta \cong R_S$, this Heegaard surface may be identified with $\underline{\Sigma}$. Under this identification, it is not hard to see that the Heegaard diagram $(\underline{\Sigma}, \beta, \alpha)$ specifies a splitting of precisely this form. Similar reasoning shows that $(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \alpha)$ determines an analogous Heegaard splitting of a closure $Y_\gamma =: -Y$ of $(-M, -\Gamma)$, with distinguished surface $R_\gamma =: -R$.[12]



FIGURE 7. Left, a schematic of the closure Y_β. Right, a schematic of the standard Heegaard splitting of the closure: the handlebody H_α is the union of V_α and T_α, shown in white and light gray, respectively; the handlebody H_β is the union of V_β and T_β, shown in medium and dark gray, respectively.

We turn now to the claim about the triple diagram. Viewing $-H(S)$ as the sutured manifold determined by the sutured Heegaard diagram

$$(\Sigma, \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}),$$

it is easy to see that $\gamma_i \subset \Sigma$ is isotopic in $-H(S)$ to the curve s_i in (5), for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and that the Σ-framing of γ_i coincides with the $\partial H(S)$-framing of s_i. Moreover, β_i bounds a meridional disk for γ_i. It follows rather easily that

$$(\underline{\Sigma}, \{\beta_{n+1}, \dots, \beta_{n+2g+1}\}, \alpha)$$

[12]As in the introduction, we are using $-R$ to refer to the distinguished surfaces in both $-Y_S$ and $-Y$; when more specificity is desired, we use R_β and R_γ.

specifies the complement of a *bouquet* for the link $s_1 \cup \cdots \cup s_n \subset Y_\beta$, as defined in [45], and therefore that

$$(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \beta, \alpha)$$

is a left-subordinate Heegaard triple diagram for the cobordism $W_{\beta,\gamma} =: -W$ associated to surgery on this framed link.

3.2. **Admissibility.** In order to define chain complexes and chain maps using these Heegaard diagrams, we must specify the location of the basepoint z and then isotope the attaching curves so as to make the pointed Heegaard triple diagram $(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \beta, \alpha, z)$ weakly admissible, meaning that every nontrivial periodic domain has both positive and negative multiplicities. Note that once the triple diagram is weakly admissible, the diagrams $(\underline{\Sigma}, \beta, \alpha, z)$ and $(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \alpha, z)$ will be too.

As for the location of the basepoint, let us first wind α_{n+2g+1} one and a half times along the curve δ, as in Figure 8, so that it meets each of β_{n+2g+1} and γ_{n+2g+1} in the four points

$$u_\beta, u'_\beta, v'_\beta, v_\beta \text{ and } u_\gamma, u'_\gamma, v'_\gamma, v_\gamma,$$

respectively. We place the basepoint z as shown in the figure.



FIGURE 8. Left, the curve δ. Middle, the result of winding α_{n+2g+1} around δ, and the basepoint z. Right, a closeup of $\alpha_{n+2g+1}, \beta_{n+2g+1}, \gamma_{n+2g+1}$ near the intersection points u_β, u'_β, v'_β, v_β and u_γ, u'_γ, v'_γ, v_γ and Θ^{n+2g+1}; the triangle Δ^{n+2g+1} is shaded.

Establishing weak admissibility (see Proposition 3.2) requires a thorough accounting of the periodic domains in the pointed Heegaard triple diagram $(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \beta, \alpha, z)$. To begin with, let us henceforth orient the curves β_i and α_i

- as in Figure 3 for $i = 1, \ldots, n$,
- as in Figure 6 for $i = n+1, \ldots, n+2g$, and
- as in Figure 8 for $i = n+2g+1$.

We orient each γ_i in the same direction as β_i. Let P_β and P_γ denote the (β, α)- and (γ, α)-periodic domains with multiplicities 2 and 1 in the regions Σ and S of $\underline{\Sigma}$, respectively, and

with

$$\partial P_\beta = \beta_{n+2g+1} - \alpha_{n+2g+1},$$
$$\partial P_\gamma = \gamma_{n+2g+1} - \alpha_{n+2g+1},$$

as shown in Figure 9. From our description of the Heegaard splittings of the closures Y_β and Y_γ, it is clear that P_β and P_γ represent the homology classes

$$[R_\beta] \in H_2(Y_\beta;\mathbb{Z}) \text{ and } [R_\gamma] \in H_2(Y_\gamma;\mathbb{Z}),$$

where R_β and R_γ are the genus g distinguished surfaces in Y_β and Y_γ.



FIGURE 9. The multiplicities of P_β near β_{n+2g+1} and α_{n+2g+1}. R_1 is the small bigon region with multiplicity -1.

For $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g+1$, let P_i denote the small (γ,β)-periodic domain with

$$\partial P_i = \gamma_i - \beta_i.$$

The collection

$$\{P_\gamma, P_{n+1}, \dots, P_{n+2g+1}\}$$

is linearly independent in the $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space of rational periodic domains for $(\underline{\Sigma},\gamma,\beta,\alpha,z)$. It therefore extends to a basis

$$\{P_\gamma, P_{n+1}, \dots, P_{n+2g+1}, Q_1, \dots, Q_m\} \tag{10}$$

for this vector space (note that $P_\beta = P_\gamma - P_{n+2g+1}$). By adding multiples of P_i, we may assume that none of the Q_j contain multiples of β_i in their boundaries, for any $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g+1$. Note that for each such i, there is an oriented curve in $\underline{\Sigma}$ which intersects γ_i and α_i positively in exactly one point each, intersects all other γ and α curves zero times algebraically, and is disjoint from $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$. Thus, γ_i and α_i occur with opposite multiplicities in the boundary of each Q_j. In particular, by adding multiples of P_γ, we may assume that none of the Q_j

contain multiples of γ_{n+2g+1} or α_{n+2g+1} in their boundaries. By further change of basis, we may also assume that

$$\partial Q_j = \alpha_{i_j} - \gamma_{i_j} + \sum_{k=1}^{i_j-1} a_{j,k}(\alpha_k - \gamma_k) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} b_{j,k}\beta_k, \tag{11}$$

where, for some p,

$$1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_p \leq n,$$

$$n+1 \leq i_{p+1} < \cdots < i_m \leq n+2g.$$

We may also assume that $a_{j,i_\ell} = 0$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, m$.

Since all of the $Q_1, \dots, Q_p$ are disjoint from $\gamma_i, \beta_i, \alpha_i$ for $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g+1$ and satisfy $n_z = 0$, each must have multiplicity 0 in every region of $\underline{\Sigma} \smallsetminus \gamma \smallsetminus \beta \smallsetminus \alpha$ which intersects $\partial\Sigma \subset \underline{\Sigma}$. In other words, these $Q_1, \dots, Q_p$ are rational periodic domains for the sutured Heegaard triple diagram

$$(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}).$$

In fact, the collection $\{Q_1, \dots, Q_p\}$ is a basis for the vector space of such domains. This will henceforth be our preferred basis for this vector space.

In order to establish weak admissibility, we will isotope the α curves by a procedure known as *winding*, described below.

Note that for each $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g$, there is a homologically essential curve $\nu_i \subset \underline{R}_S$ such that ν_i intersects α_i exactly once and is disjoint from all other α_j. We may assume that ν_i is disjoint from the disks $D_1, \dots, D_n$ in (9). Let

$$\eta_i = \varphi_\alpha(\nu_i) \subset \underline{R}_\Sigma \subset \underline{\Sigma},$$

where φ_α is the map defined following (9). Then η_i also intersects α_i exactly once and is disjoint from all other α curves. Let η_i^+ and η_i^- be parallel copies of η_i, oriented as on the left in Figure 10. One can then talk about *winding* α_i along these curves in the directions given by their orientations. The diagram on the right in Figure 10 shows the result of winding α_i once along each of η_i^+ and η_i^-. This winding will be key not only for achieving admissibility, but also for many of the other results in this section.



FIGURE 10. Left, the intersection of η_i^+ and η_i^- with α_i, and the points w_i^+ and w_i^-. Right, the curve α_i after winding once along η_i^+ and η_i^-.

In what follows, we will need to keep track of the effect of such winding on the coefficients of various domains of these Heegaard diagrams. In order to do so, we introduce new basepoints

$$w_1^+, \dots, w_{n+2g}^+ \text{ and } w_1^-, \dots, w_{n+2g}^- \subset \underline{\Sigma}, \tag{12}$$

where

- $w_i^\pm$ are the points in $H_i \subset \Sigma \subset \underline{\Sigma}$ shown in Figure 3, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and
- $w_i^\pm$ are the points on $\eta_i^\pm$ shown in Figure 10, for $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g$.

Note that

$$n_{w_i^\pm}(P_j) = 0 \tag{13}$$

for all i, j. Moreover, for $j, k = 1, \dots, p$ with $k \neq j$, we have that

$$n_{w_{i_j}^\pm}(Q_j) = \pm 1 \text{ and } n_{w_{i_k}^\pm}(Q_j) = 0. \tag{14}$$

For j, k in this range, the above quantities are unaffected by the winding described above. On the other hand, for $j = p+1, \dots, m$, the quantity

$$n_{w_{i_j}^\pm}(Q_j)$$

changes by ± 1 after winding α_{i_j} along $\eta_{i_j}^\pm$ and is unaffected by all other winding. Given a domain D of the pointed triple diagram $(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \beta, \alpha, z)$, we will hereafter use the shorthand $\underline{n}_{w_i}(D)$ for the minimum

$$\underline{n}_{w_i}(D) = \min\{n_{w_i^+}(D), n_{w_i^-}(D)\}.$$

Below, we explain how to achieve weak admissibility via winding.

Proposition 3.2. *The diagram $(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \beta, \alpha, z)$ can be made weakly admissible by winding each α_i along η_i^+ and η_i^- in the directions given by their orientations sufficiently many times.*

Proof. Let

$$K = \max\left\{|n_{w_i^\pm}(Q_j)| \mid i = 1, \dots, n+2g,\ j = 1, \dots, m\right\}.$$

Choose some

$$N > m^2K^2 + mK.$$

We claim that the pointed Heegaard triple diagram $(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \beta, \alpha, z)$ becomes weakly admissible after winding each α_i along η_i^+ and η_i^- at least N times. Indeed, suppose we have performed this winding. It suffices to show that every nontrivial periodic domain has negative multiplicity in some region (for, if that's the case, then every nontrivial periodic domain must also have positive multiplicity in some region). Let P be such a periodic domain. Then we can write P as a linear combination

$$P = a_\gamma P_\gamma + \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+2g+1} a_i P_i + \sum_{i=1}^{p} b_i Q_i + \sum_{i=p+1}^{m} c_i Q_i$$

with integer coefficients. Note that P_γ has multiplicities -1 and $+1$ in the regions R_1 and R_2, respectively, indicated in Figure 9. The multiplicities of the other P_i and Q_j are zero in these regions, so P has a negative multiplicity if a_γ is nonzero. Let us therefore assume that $a_\gamma = 0$.

If all c_i are zero, then

$$n_{w_{i_j}^{\pm}}(P) = \pm b_i$$

for $j = 1, \dots, p$ by (13) and (14). This means that P has negative multiplicity $-|b_i|$ in some region if b_i is nonzero. If, on the other hand, all b_i are zero, then some a_i must be nonzero as P is nontrivial. But then P has negative multiplicity $-|a_i|$ in some region. In conclusion, P must have a negative multiplicity if all c_i are zero. Let us therefore assume that some c_i is nonzero.

Suppose

$$|b_j| = \max\{|b_1|, \dots, |b_p|\} \text{ and } |c_k| = \max\{|c_{p+1}|, \dots, |c_m|\}.$$

Before winding, we have that

$$n_{w_{i_k}^{\pm}}(P) \leq |b_j|pK + |c_k|(m-p)K \leq |b_j|mK + |c_k|mK.$$

After winding, we therefore have that the minimum $\underline{n}_{w_{i_k}}(P)$ satisfies

$$\underline{n}_{w_{i_k}}(P) \leq |b_j|mK + |c_k|mK - |c_k|N < |b_j|mK - |c_k|m^2K^2, \tag{15}$$

where the latter inequality is strict since c_k is nonzero. Note that

$$\underline{n}_{w_{i_j}}(P) \leq |c_k|(m-p)K - |b_j| \leq |c_k|mK - |b_j| \tag{16}$$

both before and after winding. Combining inequalities (15) and (16), we have that

$$\underline{n}_{w_{i_k}}(P) + mK\underline{n}_{w_{i_j}}(P) < 0$$

after winding. Therefore, at least one of $\underline{n}_{w_{i_k}}(P)$ or $\underline{n}_{w_{i_j}}(P)$ is negative after winding.

We have thus shown that after winding N times, every nontrivial periodic domain has a negative multiplicity. This completes the proof. □

We will henceforth assume that the diagram $(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \beta, \alpha, z)$ has been made weakly admissible by winding as in Proposition 3.2.

3.3. **Bottom Spin^c structures.** Next, we analyze the portions of the chain complexes

$$CF^+(\beta, \alpha) := CF^+(\underline{\Sigma}, \beta, \alpha, z) \text{ and } CF^+(\gamma, \alpha, z) := CF^+(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \alpha, z)$$

in the bottom Spin^c structures with respect to the genus g distinguished surfaces $R_\beta \subset Y_\beta$ and $R_\gamma \subset Y_\gamma$. Recall from the discussion above that the (β, α)- and (γ, α)-periodic domains P_β and P_γ represent the homology classes of these distinguished surfaces. Suppose $[\mathbf{x}, i]$ is a generator of $CF^+(\beta, \alpha)$ or $CF^+(\gamma, \alpha)$. According to [42], we have

$$\langle c_1(\mathfrak{s}_z(\mathbf{x})), [R_\beta] \rangle = e(P_\beta) + 2n_{\mathbf{x}}(P_\beta), \text{ or} \tag{17}$$

$$\langle c_1(\mathfrak{s}_z(\mathbf{x})), [R_\gamma] \rangle = e(P_\gamma) + 2n_{\mathbf{x}}(P_\gamma), \tag{18}$$

respectively, where $e(D)$ refers to the *Euler measure* of the domain D. For each $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g$, let x_β^i and x_γ^i be the unique intersection points

$$x_\beta^i = \beta_i \cap \alpha_i \cap \underline{R}_S,$$
$$x_\gamma^i = \gamma_i \cap \alpha_i \cap \underline{R}_S,$$

shown in Figure 6, and define

$$\mathbf{x}_\beta = \{x_\beta^{n+1}, \dots, x_\beta^{n+2g}\} \in \mathrm{Sym}^{2g}(\underline{R}_S),$$
$$\mathbf{x}_\gamma = \{x_\gamma^{n+1}, \dots, x_\gamma^{n+2g}\} \in \mathrm{Sym}^{2g}(\underline{R}_S).$$

Let $CF^+(\beta, \alpha | R_\beta)$ denote the direct summand of $CF^+(\beta, \alpha)$ generated by generators $[\mathbf{x}, i]$ with

$$\langle c_1(\mathfrak{s}_z(\mathbf{x})), [R_\beta] \rangle = 2 - 2g,$$

and define $CF^+(\gamma, \alpha | R_\gamma)$ analogously, replacing β with γ. We have the following characterization of the generators in these bottom Spin^c structures.

Lemma 3.3. *A generator $[\mathbf{x}, i] \in CF^+(\beta, \alpha)$ is in $CF^+(\beta, \alpha | R_\beta)$ iff $\mathbf{x}$ is of the form*

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta \quad \text{or} \quad \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta,$$

where

$$\mathbf{y} \in (\beta_1 \times \cdots \times \beta_n) \cap (\alpha_1 \times \cdots \times \alpha_n) \subset \mathrm{Sym}^n(\Sigma).$$

The analogous statement holds for generators of $CF^+(\gamma, \alpha)$, replacing β with γ.

Proof. First, let us suppose that $\mathbf{x}$ is of the form described in the lemma. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} e(P_\beta) &= 2\chi(\underline{R}_\Sigma) + \chi(\underline{R}_S) = -6g - 4n, \\ n_{\mathbf{y}}(P_\beta) &= 2n, \\ n_{\mathbf{x}_\beta}(P_\beta) &= 2g, \\ n_{u_\beta}(P_\beta) = n_{v_\beta}(P_\beta) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

The formula (17) then implies that $[\mathbf{x}, i] \in CF^+(\beta, \alpha | R_\beta)$, as desired. For the converse, it is easy to see that if $\mathbf{x}$ is not of this form, then $n_{\mathbf{x}}(P_\beta) > 2n + 2g + 1$ (changing $\mathbf{x}$ from a generator of this form to another generator moves intersection points from the portion of $\underline{\Sigma}$ where P_β has multiplicity 1 to the portion where it has multiplicity 2) which implies that

$$\langle c_1(\mathfrak{s}_z(\mathbf{x})), [R_\beta] \rangle > 2 - 2g.$$

See [33] for what is virtually the same argument. □

3.4. **Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 imply Main Theorem.** Below, we state Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 and explain how they imply Theorem 1.12. We first introduce some notation.

Let us fix an oriented, embedded curve

$$\eta \subset \underline{R}_S \subset \underline{\Sigma}. \tag{19}$$

This curve defines curves in Y_β and Y_γ which we will also denote by η. One may then consider the complexes with twisted coefficients

$$CF^+(\beta, \alpha; \Gamma_\eta) \text{ and } CF^+(\gamma, \alpha; \Gamma_\eta)$$

and their corresponding homologies

$$HF^+(Y_\beta; \Gamma_\eta) \text{ and } HF^+(Y_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta),$$

as defined in Subsection 2.4. Let

$$\nu = \eta \times I \subset W_{\beta,\gamma}$$

be the cylindrical cobordism from $\eta \subset Y_\beta$ to $\eta \subset Y_\gamma$. Let

$$\Theta = \{\Theta^1, \dots, \Theta^{n+2g+1}\} \in CF^+(\gamma, \beta)$$

denote the generator in the top Maslov grading, where each Θ^i is one of the two intersection points between γ_i and β_i, as shown in Figures 3, 6, and 8. The map

$$HF^+(W_{\beta,\gamma}; \Gamma_\nu) : HF^+(Y_\beta; \Gamma_\eta) \to HF^+(Y_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta)$$

is then defined as in Subsection 2.4, in terms of a chain map

$$f^+_{\gamma,\beta,\alpha;\Gamma_\nu} : CF^+(\beta, \alpha; \Gamma_\eta) \to CF^+(\gamma, \alpha; \Gamma_\eta)$$

defined on a generator $[\mathbf{x}, i]$ by

$$f^+_{\gamma,\beta,\alpha;\Gamma_\nu}([\mathbf{x}, i]) = \sum_{\substack{\phi \in \pi_2(\Theta, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \\ \mu(\phi) = 0}} \#\mathcal{M}(\phi) \cdot [\mathbf{y}, i - n_z(\phi)] \cdot t^{\partial_\alpha(\phi) \cdot \eta}.$$

As usual, this map decomposes over Spin^c structures on $W_{\beta,\gamma}$. Since R_β and R_γ are homologous (in fact, isotopic) in $W_{\beta,\gamma}$, we have that

$$\langle c_1(\mathfrak{t}|_{Y_\beta}), [R_\beta] \rangle = \langle c_1(\mathfrak{t}|_{Y_\gamma}), [R_\gamma] \rangle$$

for any $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Spin}^c(W_{\beta,\gamma})$. The chain map above therefore restricts to a map

$$f^+_{\gamma,\beta,\alpha;\Gamma_\nu} : CF^+(\beta, \alpha | R_\beta; \Gamma_\eta) \to CF^+(\gamma, \alpha | R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta),$$

which gives rise to the map

$$G := HF^+(W_{\beta,\gamma} | R_\beta \sim R_\gamma; \Gamma_\nu) : HF^+(Y_\beta | R_\beta; \Gamma_\eta) \to HF^+(Y_\gamma | R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta) \tag{20}$$

on homology. This is precisely the map we called G in the introduction. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let c^i_β and c^i_γ be the unique intersection points

$$c^i_\beta = \beta_i \cap \alpha_i \cap H_i,$$
$$c^i_\gamma = \gamma_i \cap \alpha_i \cap H_i$$

shown in Figure 3, and define

$$\mathbf{c}_\beta = \{c^1_\beta, \dots, c^n_\beta\} \in SFC(\Sigma, \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}),$$
$$\mathbf{c}_\gamma = \{c^1_\gamma, \dots, c^n_\gamma\} \in SFC(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}).$$

Note that these are representatives of the contact invariants associated to the partial open books $(S, \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset)$ and $(S, P, h, \{c_1, \dots, c_n\})$, respectively.

Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 below are the two main theorems of this section.

Theorem 3.4. *For sufficiently large g and sufficient winding, the map $f^+_{\gamma,\beta,\alpha;\Gamma_\nu}$ sends*

$$[\mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, 0] \text{ to } [\mathbf{c}_\gamma \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0].$$

Theorem 3.5. *For sufficiently large g and sufficient winding, there are quasi-isomorphisms*

$$f_\beta : SFC(\Sigma, \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \otimes \Lambda \to CF^+(\beta, \alpha | R_\beta; \Gamma_\eta) \tag{21}$$

$$f_\gamma : SFC(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \otimes \Lambda \to CF^+(\gamma, \alpha | R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta) \tag{22}$$

sending $\mathbf{c}_\beta \otimes 1$ to $[\mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, 0]$ and $\mathbf{c}_\gamma \otimes 1$ to $[\mathbf{c}_\gamma \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0]$, respectively.

We will prove these theorems in the next Subsection. But first, we demonstrate below how they imply Theorem 1.12 and, hence, our Main Theorem, Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.12. Suppose g is sufficiently large and that we have wound sufficiently to guarantee the conclusions of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5.

Note that

$$SFC(\Sigma, \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \otimes \Lambda$$

has rank 1, generated by $\mathbf{c}_\beta \otimes 1$. It then follows from Theorem 3.5 that $[\mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, 0]$ represents a generator of

$$HF^+(Y_\beta | R_\beta; \Gamma_\eta) = HF^+(-Y_S | -R; \Gamma_\eta) \cong \Lambda.$$

But this generator is precisely the contact invariant $c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}_S)$ of a contact closure $(Y_S, R, \bar{\xi}_S)$ of $(H(S), \xi_S)$, as follows from the discussion in Subsection 2.2 and Theorem 1.1. That is,

$$c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}_S) = [[\mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, 0]]. \tag{23}$$

Theorem 3.4 implies that the map

$$G := HF^+(W_{\beta,\gamma} | R_\beta \sim R_\gamma; \Gamma_\nu) : HF^+(Y_\beta | R_\beta; \Gamma_\eta) \to HF^+(Y_\gamma | R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta)$$

sends $[[\mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, 0]]$ to $[[\mathbf{c}_\gamma \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0]]$. On the other hand, the functoriality of the contact invariant under contact $(+1)$-surgeries (Theorem 2.6) implies that this map G, now viewed as

$$G := HF^+(-W | -R; \Gamma_\nu) : HF^+(-Y_S | -R; \Gamma_\eta) \to HF^+(-Y | -R; \Gamma_\eta)$$

sends $c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}_S)$ to the contact invariant $c_{HF}(\bar{\xi})$ of a corresponding contact closure $(Y, R, \bar{\xi})$ of (M, Γ, ξ). Combined with (23), this means that

$$c_{HF}(\bar{\xi}) = [[\mathbf{c}_\gamma \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0]]. \tag{24}$$

By definition (Subsection 2.3), we have that

$$c_{HF}(\xi) \otimes 1 = [\mathbf{c}_\gamma \otimes 1] \in H_*(SFC(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \otimes \Lambda) = SFH(-M, -\Gamma) \otimes \Lambda.$$

Theorem 3.5, combined with (24), then implies that the map

$$F := (f_\gamma)_* : SFH(-M, -\Gamma) \otimes \Lambda \to HF^+(Y_\gamma | R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta) = HF^+(-Y | -R; \Gamma_\eta)$$

sends $c_{HF}(\xi) \otimes 1$ to $c_{HF}(\bar{\xi})$, as claimed in Theorem 1.12. □

Remark 3.6. As discussed in Subsection 2.2, the equalities in (23) and (24) hold up to multiplication by units in Λ, a fact that has no real bearing on our results.

3.5. **Proofs of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5.** Below, we prove Theorems 3.4 and 3.5, which will complete the proof of our Main Theorem, Theorem 1.2. These proofs occupy the rest of this section.

Our proof of Theorem 3.4 will closely follow that of Proposition 3.2. In preparation for the proof, we introduce the following notation. Let Δ^i be the small triangle with vertices at

$$\begin{cases} \Theta^i, c^i_\beta, c^i_\gamma, & \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n, \\ \Theta^i, x^i_\beta, x^i_\gamma, & \text{for } i = n+1, \dots, n+2g, \\ \Theta^i, u_\beta, u_\gamma, & \text{for } i = n+2g+1, \end{cases}$$

as shown shaded in Figures 3, 6, and 8, and let

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\Sigma &= \Delta^1 + \cdots + \Delta^n, \\ \Delta_S &= \Delta^{n+1} + \cdots + \Delta^{n+2g+1}, \\ \Delta_{\underline{\Sigma}} &= \Delta_\Sigma + \Delta_S. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.3 and the discussion following it, the image

$$f^+_{\gamma,\beta,\alpha;\Gamma_\nu}([\mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, 0])$$

is a linear combination of generators of the form $[\mathbf{y} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0]$, where $s \in \{u_\gamma, v_\gamma\}$.

As we will see, Theorem 3.4 follows more or less immediately from the lemma below.

Lemma 3.7. *Fix an intersection point*

$$\mathbf{y} \in (\gamma_1 \times \cdots \times \gamma_n) \cap (\alpha_1 \times \cdots \times \alpha_n) \in \mathrm{Sym}^n(\Sigma). \tag{25}$$

For sufficiently large g and sufficient winding, the following is true: if ϕ is a Whitney triangle

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\Theta, \mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, \mathbf{y} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $n_z(\phi) = 0$, $\mu(\phi) = 0$, and no negative multiplicities, where $s \in \{u_\gamma, v_\gamma\}$, then

- $s = u_\gamma$,
- $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c}_\gamma$, *and*
- *the domain* $D(\phi) = \Delta_{\underline{\Sigma}}$.

Proof. Fix some $\mathbf{y}$ as in (25). We will break the proof into two cases, according to whether $s = u_\gamma$ or $s = v_\gamma$.

Case 1: $s = u_\gamma$. Suppose $s = u_\gamma$. Fix some Whitney triangle in

$$\pi_2(\Theta, \mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, \mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with domain D satisfying $n_z(D) = 0$. Note that the boundary $\partial(D - \Delta_S)$ consists of

- integer multiples of complete γ_i, β_i, α_i curves for $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g+1$, and
- integer multiples of arcs of the γ_i, β_i, α_i curves for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

It follows, from the same sort of reasoning that was applied to the Q_j in the paragraph above equation (11), that there is a linear combination of the basis elements in (10) with integer coefficients which, when added to $D - \Delta_S$, results in a domain D' whose boundary is

- disjoint from β_i for $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g+1$,
- disjoint from α_{i_j} and γ_{i_j} for $j = p+1, \dots, m$ (recall that $n+1 \leq i_j \leq n+2g$ for such j), and
- disjoint from α_{n+2g+1} and γ_{n+2g+1}.

Note that D' has corners at the components of $\{\Theta^1, \dots, \Theta^n\}$, $\mathbf{c}_\beta$, and $\mathbf{y}$.

Let

$$K = \max\left\{|n_{w_i^\pm}(Q_j)| + |n_{w_i^\pm}(D')| \mid i = 1, \dots, n+2g,\ j = 1, \dots, m\right\}.$$

Choose some

$$N > K + m(m+1)K^2 + mK.$$

We claim that after winding each α_i along the $\eta_i^\pm$ at least N times, any Whitney triangle ϕ satisfying the hypotheses of the lemma must have domain $D(\phi) = \underline{\Sigma}$, which will also imply that $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c}_\gamma$. Indeed, suppose we have performed this winding, and that

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\Theta, \mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, \mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

satisfies the hypotheses of the lemma. Then the domain $D(\phi)$ differs from D by a periodic domain. We may therefore write $D(\phi)$ as a linear combination

$$D(\phi) = D' + \Delta_S + a_\gamma P_\gamma + \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+2g+1} a_i P_i + \sum_{i=1}^{p} b_i Q_i + \sum_{i=p+1}^{m} c_i Q_i, \tag{26}$$

with integer coefficients.

Note that P_γ has multiplicities -1 and $+1$ in the regions R_1 and R_2, respectively, shown in Figure 9. The multiplicity of D' is zero in these regions since $n_z(D') = 0$ and its boundary is disjoint from $\alpha_{n+2g+1}, \beta_{n+2g+1}, \gamma_{n+2g+1}$. The multiplicities of the P_i and Q_j are also zero in these regions. Since $D(\phi)$ has no negative multiplicities, we must therefore have that $a_\gamma = 0$. Thus,

$$D(\phi) = D' + \Delta_S + \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+2g+1} a_i P_i + \sum_{i=1}^{p} b_i Q_i + \sum_{i=p+1}^{m} c_i Q_i, \tag{27}$$

We next show that all c_i are zero. Suppose not. Suppose

$$|b_j| = \max\left\{|b_1|, \dots, |b_p|\right\} \text{ and } |c_k| = \max\left\{|c_{p+1}|, \dots, |c_m|\right\}.$$

Before winding, we would have had that

$$n_{w_{i_k}^\pm}(D(\phi)) \leq K + |b_j|pK + |c_k|(m-p)K \leq K + |b_j|mK + |c_k|mK,$$

given (27). After winding, we therefore have that

$$\underline{n}_{w_{i_k}}(D(\phi)) \leq K + |b_j|mK + |c_k|mK - |c_k|N < K + |b_j|mK - |c_k|K - |c_k|m(m+1)K^2.$$

Our assumption that some c_i is nonzero implies that $|c_k| \geq 1$, which, in combination with the inequality above, implies that

$$\underline{n}_{w_{i_k}}(D(\phi)) < |b_j|mK - |c_k|m(m+1)K^2.$$

Note that

$$\underline{n}_{w_{i_j}}(D(\phi)) \leq K + |c_k|(m-p)K - |b_j| \leq K + |c_k|mK - |b_j| \tag{28}$$

both before and after winding. Since $\underline{n}_{w_{i_k}}(D(\phi))$ is nonnegative after winding, we must have that

$$|b_j| > |c_k|(m+1)K,$$

which then implies that $\underline{n}_{w_{i_j}}(D(\phi))$ is negative by (28), a contradiction. Thus, all c_i are zero. We therefore have that

$$D(\phi) = D' + \Delta_S + \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+2g+1} a_i P_i + \sum_{i=1}^{p} b_i Q_i. \tag{29}$$

We next argue that the boundary $\partial D'$ is disjoint from α_i for all $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g$. Suppose instead that some such α_i appears in $\partial D'$ with nonzero integer coefficient ℓ. Before winding, we would have had that

$$n_{w_i^{\pm}}(D(\phi)) \leq K + |b_j|pK \leq K + |b_j|mK,$$

given (29). After winding, we therefore have that

$$\underline{n}_{w_i}(D(\phi)) \leq K + |b_j|mK - |\ell|N < |b_j|mK - |\ell|m(m+1)K^2.$$

Since $\underline{n}_{w_i}(D(\phi))$ is nonnegative after winding, we have that

$$|b_j| > |\ell|(m+1)K > K,$$

which then implies that $\underline{n}_{w_{i_j}}(D(\phi))$ is negative by (28), a contradiction. Thus, $\partial D'$ is disjoint from α_i for all $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g$.

Since $n_z(D') = 0$ and $\partial D'$ is disjoint from the curves $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i$, for $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g+1$, we may conclude that D' has multiplicity zero outside of $\Sigma \subset \underline{\Sigma}$. Then each P_i has a negative multiplicity in some region where the multiplicities of D', Δ_S, and Q_j are zero, for all $j = 1, \dots, p$. So, if any a_i is nonzero, then $D(\phi)$ has a negative multiplicity $-|a_i|$ in some region, a contradiction. Thus, all a_i are zero. In summary, we have shown that

$$D(\phi) = D' + \Delta_S + \sum_{i=1}^{p} b_i Q_i,$$

where D' is supported in $\Sigma \subset \underline{\Sigma}$. This implies that

$$D(\phi) - \Delta_S = D' + \sum_{i=1}^{p} b_i Q_i$$

is the domain of a Whitney triangle

$$\phi' \in \pi_2(\{\Theta^1, \dots, \Theta^n\}, \mathbf{c}_\beta, \mathbf{y})$$

with respect to the sutured Heegaard triple diagram

$$(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}).$$

Moreover, the domain $D(\phi')$ cannot have any negative multiplicities: if it did, then so would $D(\phi)$ since Δ_S does not completely cover any region of $D(\phi')$. We claim that in order for $D(\phi')$ to have no negative multiplicities, it must be that $D(\phi') = \Delta_\Sigma$. To see this, we refer the diagram in Figure 11 below which shows the possible multiplicities of $D(\phi')$ near Θ^i and c^i_β. Either $y = -x$ or $y = 1 - x$. In the first case, we must have $x = 0$. But that would imply that $x - 1 = -1$, which would mean that $D(\phi')$ has a negative multiplicity. Therefore, $y = 1 - x$. But this forces $x = 1$. It follows that the domain of $D(\phi')$ near Θ^i and c^i_β consists just of the triangle Δ^i. This implies that $D(\phi') = \Delta_\Sigma$, which then implies that

$$D(\phi) = \Delta_\Sigma + \Delta_S = \Delta_{\underline{\Sigma}},$$

and, hence, that $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c}_\gamma$, as claimed in the lemma.



FIGURE 11. The possible multiplicities of $D(\phi')$ near Θ^i and c^i_β.

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.7 in the case $s = u_\gamma$.

Case 2: $s = v_\gamma$. Suppose $s = v_\gamma$. Let D, D', and N be as above. We will verify that for sufficiently large g and sufficient winding, there is no Whitney triangle ϕ satisfying the hypotheses of the lemma. We break this verification into two subcases.

Subcase 2.1: no triangle. Suppose there does *not* exist a Whitney triangle in

$$\pi_2(\{\Theta^1, \dots, \Theta^n\}, \mathbf{c}_\beta, \mathbf{y})$$

with respect to the sutured Heegaard triple diagram

$$(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}).$$

We claim that after winding each α_i along the $\eta_i^\pm$ at least $N+1$ times, the domain of any Whitney triangle

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\Theta, \mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, \mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $n_z(\phi) = 0$ has a negative multiplicity, in which case ϕ does not satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma, and we are done. Indeed, suppose we have performed this winding, and that ϕ is such a triangle. Assume, for a contradiction, that $D(\phi)$ has no negative multiplicities.

Let C be the domain shown in Figure 12, representing an immersed bigon in $\underline{\Sigma}$ with vertices at u_γ and v_γ. Then $D+C-\underline{\Sigma}$ is the domain of a Whitney triangle in

$$\pi_2(\Theta, \mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, \mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$



FIGURE 12. The immersed bigon C with vertices at u_γ and v_γ. We have labeled the multiplicities of the regions forming the bigon. Note that C has multiplicities 2 and 0 in the regions R_1 and R_2, respectively, that were defined in Figure 9. Recall that R_1 is the small bigon region containing the number 2 in this figure.

and satisfies $n_z(D+C-\underline{\Sigma}) = 0$. The domain $D(\phi)$ therefore differs from $D+C-\underline{\Sigma}$ by a periodic domain. We may then write $D(\phi)$ as a linear combination

$$D(\phi) = D' + C - \underline{\Sigma} + \Delta_S + a_\gamma P_\gamma + \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+2g+1} a_i P_i + \sum_{i=1}^{p} b_i Q_i + \sum_{i=p+1}^{m} c_i Q_i$$

with integer coefficients.

Note that $D(\phi)$ has multiplicities $1-a_\gamma$ and $-1+a_\gamma$ in the regions R_1 and R_2, respectively. Since we are assuming that $D(\phi)$ has no negative multiplicities, it must be that $a_\gamma = 1$. Our proof of Lemma 3.7 in the case $s = u_\gamma$ above easily extends to show that if some c_i is nonzero then the quantity

$$\underline{n}_{w_j}\left(D' + \Delta_S + \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+2g+1} a_i P_i + \sum_{i=1}^{p} b_i Q_i + \sum_{i=p+1}^{m} c_i Q_i\right) \tag{30}$$

is less than -1 for some j, due to the winding. Since

$$n_{w_j^\pm}(C - \underline{\Sigma} + P_\gamma) = 1,$$

the quantity $\underline{n}_{w_j}(D(\phi))$ is 1 more than the quantity in (30). As $D(\phi)$ has no negative multiplicities, it must be that all $c_i = 0$. A similar argument as in the case $s = u_\gamma$ then shows that the boundary $\partial D'$ must be disjoint from α_i for all $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g+1$ (and that all $a_i = 0$). It follows that D' is supported in $\Sigma \subset \underline{\Sigma}$ and represents a Whitney triangle in

$$\pi_2(\{\Theta^1, \dots, \Theta^n\}, \mathbf{c}_\beta, \mathbf{y})$$

with respect to the sutured Heegaard triple diagram

$$(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n\}, \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}).$$

But this yields the desired contradiction since we are assuming that no such triangle exists in this subcase.

Subcase 2.2: triangle. Suppose there *does* exist a Whitney triangle in

$$\pi_2(\{\Theta^1, \ldots, \Theta^n\}, \mathbf{c}_\beta, \mathbf{y})$$

with respect to the sutured Heegaard triple diagram

$$(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n\}, \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}).$$

Let E denote its domain. For $j = 1, \ldots, p$, let

$$W_j = \underline{n}_{w_{i_j}}(E) + 1,$$

and let

$$M = \max\left\{\mu\left(E + C + \Delta_S + \sum_{i=1}^{p} b_i Q_i\right) \;\middle|\; |b_1| \leq W_1, \ldots, |b_p| \leq W_p\right\}.$$

Note that M depends only on data defined in terms of the sutured Heegaard triple diagram. We claim that if $2g > M$ and we have wound each α_i along the $\eta_i^{\pm}$ at least $N+1$ times, then the domain of any Whitney triangle

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\Theta, \mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, \mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $n_z(\phi) = 0$ either has a negative multiplicity or else $\mu(\phi) < 0$, in either of which cases ϕ does not satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma, and we are done. Indeed, suppose $2g > M$ and that we have performed this winding. Let ϕ be such a Whitney triangle. As before, we may write $D(\phi)$ as a linear combination

$$D(\phi) = D + C - \underline{\Sigma} + \Delta_S + a_\gamma P_\gamma + \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+2g+1} a_i P_i + \sum_{i=1}^{p} b_i Q_i + \sum_{i=p+1}^{m} c_i Q_i$$

with integer coefficients. Let us suppose that $D(\phi)$ has no negative multiplicities and show that $\mu(\phi) < 0$. The arguments from before show that since $D(\phi)$ has no negative multiplicities, $a_\gamma = 1$, all $c_i = 0$, and all $a_i = 0$, due to the winding. Thus,

$$D(\phi) = E + C - \underline{\Sigma} + \Delta_S + P_\gamma + \sum_{i=1}^{p} b_i Q_i.$$

It follows that for each $j = 1, \ldots, p$,

$$\underline{n}_{w_{i_j}}(D(\phi)) = \underline{n}_{w_{i_j}}(E) + 1 - |b_j| = W_j - |b_j|.$$

As we are assuming that $D(\phi)$ has no negative multiplicities, we must have that $|b_j| \leq W_j$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, p$. Let

$$\phi' \in \pi_2(\Theta, \mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, \mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

be the Whitney triangle with domain

$$D(\phi') = E + C + \Delta_S + \sum_{i=1}^{p} b_i Q_i,$$

and let

$$\psi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, \mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

be the Whitney disk with domain

$$D(\psi) = -\underline{\Sigma} + P_\gamma.$$

Since

$$D(\phi) = D(\phi') + D(\psi),$$

the Whitney triangle ϕ is the concatenation of ϕ' with ψ. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(\phi) &= \mu(\phi') + \mu(\psi) \\
&\leq M + \mu(\psi) \\
&= M + \mu(-\underline{\Sigma}) + \mu(P_\gamma) \\
&= M - 2 + e(P_\gamma) + 2n_{\mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma}(P_\gamma) \\
&= M - 2 + 2 - 2g \\
&= M - 2g.
\end{aligned}$$

The formula for $\mu(P_\gamma)$ comes from [35] and its calculation is contained in the proof of Lemma 3.3. Since $2g > M$, we have that $\mu(\phi) < 0$, as desired.

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.7 in the case $s = v_\gamma$, which, in turn, completes the proof of Lemma 3.7. □

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Since there are only finitely many $\mathbf{y}$ as in (25), Lemma 3.7 tells us that for sufficiently large g and sufficient winding,

$$f^+_{\gamma,\beta,\alpha;\Gamma_\nu}([\mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, 0]) = \#\mathcal{M}(\phi) \cdot [\mathbf{c}_\gamma \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0] \cdot t^{\partial_\alpha(\phi) \cdot \eta},$$

where ϕ is the homotopy class of Whitney triangles with domain $\Delta_{\underline{\Sigma}}$. But this homotopy class has a unique holomorphic representative, and $\Delta_{\underline{\Sigma}}$ is entirely disjoint from η. Thus,

$$\#\mathcal{M}(\phi) \cdot t^{\partial_\alpha(\phi) \cdot \eta} = 1,$$

completing the proof of Theorem 3.4. □

Remark 3.8. In the proof of Theorem 3.4, we showed that, for sufficiently large g and sufficient winding, the relevant holomorphic triangle counts for the diagram $(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \beta, \alpha, z)$ are the same as the analogous holomorphic triangle counts for the sutured triple diagram

$$(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}).$$

A similar principle is at work in the proof of Theorem 3.5 below.

The rest of this subsection is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 3.5.

The maps f_β and f_γ we have in mind in (21) and (22) of Theorem 3.5 are the Λ-linear maps

$$f_\beta : SFC(\Sigma, \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \otimes \Lambda \to CF^+(\beta, \alpha | R_\beta; \Gamma_\eta)$$
$$f_\gamma : SFC(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \otimes \Lambda \to CF^+(\gamma, \alpha | R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta)$$

which send a generator $\mathbf{x} \otimes 1$ to $[\mathbf{x} \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, 0]$ and $[\mathbf{x} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0]$, respectively. Note that

$$SFC(\Sigma, \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \otimes \Lambda$$

has rank 1, generated by $\mathbf{c}_\beta \otimes 1$. Therefore, to show f_β is a quasi-isomorphism, it suffices to prove that

$$[\mathbf{c}_\beta \cup \{u_\beta\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, 0]$$

is a cycle and generates $HF^+(Y_\beta | R_\beta; \Gamma_\eta)$. But this is essentially proven in [44, Section 3]. We will therefore focus on the harder case, involving the map f_γ. Besides, our proof that f_γ is a quasi-isomorphism, given sufficiently large g and sufficient winding, translates into to a proof that f_β is a quasi-isomorphism as well.

We will give the proof of Theorem 3.5 at the very end of this subsection, after proving several important lemmas. The proofs of these lemmas will start to feel somewhat repetitive. We include them for the reader who is interested in going through the details carefully.

To begin with, we need the following.

Lemma 3.9. *Sufficiently large g and sufficient winding guarantees that f_γ is a chain map.*

As we shall see, this follows from the lemma below, which is an analogue of Lemma 3.7.

Lemma 3.10. *Fix a pair of intersection points,*

$$\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in (\gamma_1 \times \cdots \times \gamma_n) \cap (\alpha_1 \times \cdots \times \alpha_n) \in \mathrm{Sym}^n(\Sigma). \tag{31}$$

For sufficiently large g and sufficient winding, the following is true: if ϕ is a Whitney disk

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, \mathbf{y} \cup \{s'\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $n_z(\phi) = 0$, $\mu(\phi) = 1$, and no negative multiplicities, where $s, s' \in \{u_\gamma, v_\gamma\}$, then

- *$s = s'$, and*
- *the domain $D(\phi)$ is supported in $\Sigma \subset \underline{\Sigma}$.*

Our proof of Lemma 3.10 will closely follow that of Lemma 3.7. In preparation, let

$$\{P_\gamma, S_1, \dots, S_r\} \tag{32}$$

be a basis for the vector space of rational periodic domains for $(\underline{\Sigma}, \gamma, \alpha)$, where the S_j satisfy

$$\partial S_j = \alpha_{i_j} - \gamma_{i_j} + \sum_{k=1}^{i_j - 1} a_{j,k}(\alpha_k - \gamma_k).$$

Let q satisfy

$$1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_q \leq n,$$

$$n+1 \leq i_{q+1} < \cdots < i_r \leq n+2g.$$

We may also assume that $a_{j,i_\ell} = 0$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, r$. Note that this is the doubly-periodic analogue of the condition satisfied by the periodic domains $Q_1, \dots, Q_m$ in (11). In particular, it follows that the collection $\{S_1, \dots, S_q\}$ is a basis for the space of rational periodic domains for the sutured Heegaard diagram

$$(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}).$$

We will consider this to be our preferred basis. Note, for $j, k = 1, \dots, q$ with $k \neq j$, that

$$n_{w_{i_j}^{\pm}}(S_j) = \pm 1 \text{ and } n_{w_{i_k}^{\pm}}(S_j) = 0. \tag{33}$$

For j, k in this range, the above quantities are unaffected by winding. On the other hand, for $j = q+1, \dots, r$, the quantity

$$n_{w_{i_j}^{\pm}}(S_j)$$

changes by ± 1 after winding α_{i_j} along $\eta_{i_j}^{\pm}$ and is unaffected by all other winding.

We are now ready to prove Lemma 3.10.

Proof of Lemma 3.10. Fix $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ as in (31). We will break this proof into three cases, according to whether $s = s'$ or $(s, s') = (u_\gamma, v_\gamma)$ or $(s, s') = (v_\gamma, u_\gamma)$.

Case 1: $s = s'$. Suppose $s = s'$. Fix some Whitney disk in

$$\pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, \mathbf{y} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with domain D satisfying $n_z(D) = 0$. Note that the boundary ∂D consists of

- integer multiples of complete γ_i and α_i curves for $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g+1$, and
- integer multiples of arcs of the γ_i and α_i curves for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

It follows that there is a linear combination of the basis elements in (32) with integer coefficients which, when added to D, results in a domain D' whose boundary is

- disjoint from α_{i_j} and γ_{i_j} for $j = q+1, \dots, r$, and
- disjoint from α_{n+2g+1} and γ_{n+2g+1}.

We claim that after winding each α_i along the $\eta_i^{\pm}$ sufficiently many times, any Whitney disk ϕ satisfying the hypotheses of the lemma must have domain $D(\phi)$ supported in $\Sigma \subset \underline{\Sigma}$. Indeed, suppose we have performed a large amount of winding, and that

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, \mathbf{y} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

satisfies the hypotheses of the lemma. Then the domain $D(\phi)$ differs from D by a periodic domain. We may therefore write $D(\phi)$ as a linear combination

$$D(\phi) = D' + a_\gamma P_\gamma + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i + \sum_{i=q+1}^{r} c_i S_i,$$

with integer coefficients. The exact same kind of argument as was used in the proof of Lemma 3.7, *Case 1: $s = u_\gamma$*, shows that since $D(\phi)$ has no negative multiplicities, it must be that $a_\gamma = 0$, all $c_i = 0$, and the boundary of D' is disjoint from all α_i for $i = n+1, \dots, n+2g+1$.

It follows that $D(\phi)$ is supported in $\Sigma \subset \underline{\Sigma}$, as claimed. This completes the proof in the case $s = s'$.

Case 2: $(s, s') = (u_\gamma, v_\gamma)$. Suppose $s = u_\gamma$ and $s' = v_\gamma$. Let D and D' be as above. We will verify that for sufficiently large g and sufficient winding, there is no Whitney disk satisfying the hypotheses of the lemma. We break this verification into two subcases, mirroring the proof of Lemma 3.7, *Case 2:* $s = v_\gamma$.

Subcase 2.1: no disk. Suppose there does *not* exist a Whitney disk in $\pi_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ with respect to the sutured Heegaard diagram

$$(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}).$$

We claim that after winding each α_i along the $\eta_i^{\pm}$ sufficiently many times, the domain of any Whitney disk

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, \mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $n_z(\phi) = 0$ has a negative multiplicity, in which case ϕ does not satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma, and we are done. Indeed, suppose we have performed a large amount of winding, and that ϕ is such a disk. Let C be the immersed bigon in Figure 12. Then we can write $D(\phi)$ as a linear combination

$$D(\phi) = D' + C - \underline{\Sigma} + a_\gamma P_\gamma + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i + \sum_{i=q+1}^{r} c_i S_i$$

with integer coefficients. The exact same kind of argument as was used in the second case in the proof of Lemma 3.7, *Subcase 2.1: no triangle*, shows that since $D(\phi)$ has no negative multiplicities, it must be that $a_\gamma = 1$, all $c_i = 0$, and the boundary of D' is disjoint from all α_i for $i = n{+}1, \ldots, n{+}2g{+}1$. It follows that D' is supported in $\Sigma \subset \underline{\Sigma}$ and represents a Whitney disk in $\pi_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ with respect to the sutured Heegaard diagram

$$(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}).$$

But this yields the desired contradiction since we are assuming that no such disk exists in this subcase.

Subcase 2.2: disk. Suppose there *does* exist a Whitney disk in $\pi_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ with respect to the sutured Heegaard diagram

$$(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}).$$

Let E denote its domain. For $j = 1, \ldots, q$, let

$$W_j = \underline{n}_{w_{i_j}}(E) + 1,$$

and let

$$M = \max\left\{ \mu\left(E + C + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i \right) \;\middle|\; |b_1| \leq W_1, \ldots, |b_q| \leq W_q \right\}.$$

Note that M depends only on data defined in terms of the sutured Heegaard diagram. We claim that if $2g > M$ and we have wound each α_i along the $\eta_i^{\pm}$ sufficiently many times, then the domain of any Whitney disk

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\beta, \mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $n_z(\phi) = 0$ either has a negative multiplicity or else $\mu(\phi) < 0$, in either of which cases ϕ does not satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma, and we are done. From here, our proof proceeds almost exactly as in the Proof of Lemma 3.7, *Subcase 2.2: triangle*, so we will not repeat it.

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.10 in the case $(s, s') = (u_\gamma, v_\gamma)$.

Case 3: $(s, s') = (v_\gamma, u_\gamma)$. Suppose $s = v_\gamma$ and $s' = u_\gamma$. We will verify that there is no Whitney disk satisfying the hypotheses of the lemma. Let D' and C be the domains described above, and suppose ϕ is a Whitney disk

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, \mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $n_z(\phi) = 0$. Then $D(\phi)$ is given by a linear combination

$$D(\phi) = D' - C + \underline{\Sigma} + a_\gamma P_\gamma + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i + \sum_{i=q+1}^{r} c_i S_i$$

with integer coefficients. Note that the multiplicities of $D(\phi)$ are $-1 - a_\gamma$ and $1 + a_\gamma$ in the regions R_1 and R_2, respectively. Since $D(\phi)$ has no negative multiplicities, it must be that $a_\gamma = -1$. However, in that case, $D(\phi)$ has multiplicity -1 in the region R_3 shown in Figure 9, a contradiction.

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.10 in the last case $(s, s') = (v_\gamma, u_\gamma)$. □

Proof of Lemma 3.9. Suppose g is large enough and the winding sufficient for the conclusion of Lemma 3.10 to hold. It suffices to show, for each pair $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ as in (31) that the coefficient of $[\mathbf{y} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0]$ in $f_\gamma(d\mathbf{x} \otimes 1)$ is the same as its coefficient in $\partial f_\gamma(\mathbf{x} \otimes 1)$, for $s = u_\gamma$ or v_γ, where d is the differential on

$$SFC(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\})$$

and ∂ is the differential on $CF^+(\gamma, \alpha | R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta)$. Note that both coefficients

$$\langle f_\gamma(d\mathbf{x} \otimes 1), [\mathbf{y} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0] \rangle \text{ and } \langle \partial f_\gamma(\mathbf{x} \otimes 1), [\mathbf{y} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0] \rangle$$

are zero if $s = v_\gamma$. This is by definition for the first and by Lemma 3.10 for the second. We therefore only need consider the case $s = u_\gamma$. By definition, we have that

$$\langle f_\gamma(d\mathbf{x} \otimes 1), [\mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0] \rangle = \langle d\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \rangle, \tag{34}$$

$$\langle \partial f_\gamma(\mathbf{x} \otimes 1), [\mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0] \rangle = \langle \partial([\mathbf{x} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0]), [\mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0] \rangle. \tag{35}$$

But it follows immediately from Lemma 3.10 that the coefficients on the right hand sides of (34) and (35) are equal: any Whitney disk contributing to the coefficient in (34) contributes the same amount to the coefficient in (35), and Lemma 3.10 tells us that the converse is true (note that any domain contained in Σ is disjoint from η). □

We will henceforth assume that g is sufficiently large and that we have wound sufficiently to guarantee that f_γ is a chain map.

To show that f_γ is a quasi-isomorphism (assuming sufficiently large g and sufficient winding), we will show that it is a filtered chain map for some filtrations on the domain and codomain complexes, and that it induces an isomorphism between E_1 pages of the spectral

sequences associated to these filtrations. We will first define a filtration on the codomain $CF^+(\gamma, \alpha|R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta)$ in each Spin^c structure.

Let A and B be the points in $\underline{R}_S$ and $\underline{R}_\Sigma$ shown in Figure 9. Given generators

$$[\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i] \text{ and } [\mathbf{y} \cup \{s'\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, j] \text{ of } CF^+(\gamma, \alpha|R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta)$$

representing the same Spin^c structure, for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ as in (31) and $s, s' \in \{u_\gamma, v_\gamma\}$, choose a Whitney disk

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, \mathbf{y} \cup \{s'\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $n_z(\phi) = i - j$, and define the relative grading

$$\mathcal{F}([\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i], [\mathbf{y} \cup \{s'\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, j]) = 2n_A(\phi) - n_B(\phi).$$

This relative grading is well-defined since $2n_A - n_B$ is zero on the periodic domains in (32). For each Spin^c structure, we choose some lift of this relative grading to an absolute grading, which we also denote by $\mathcal{F}$.

Lemma 3.11. *Sufficiently large g and sufficient winding guarantees that the absolute grading $\mathcal{F}$ defines a filtration.*

Proof. Fix $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ as in (31). We must show that for sufficiently large g and sufficient winding, the following is true: if the coefficient

$$[\langle \partial([\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]), \mathbf{y} \cup \{s'\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, j]\rangle \tag{36}$$

is nonzero, then

$$\mathcal{F}([\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]) \geq \mathcal{F}([\mathbf{y} \cup \{s'\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, j]).$$

We will break the proof into three cases, according to whether $s = s'$ or $(s, s') = (u_\gamma, v_\gamma)$ or $(s, s') = (v_\gamma, u_\gamma)$.

Case 1: $s = s'$. Suppose $s = s'$. Suppose the coefficient in (36) is nonzero. Then there is a Whitney disk

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, \mathbf{y} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $\mu(\phi) = 1$, with no negative multiplicities, and with $n_z(\phi) = i - j \geq 0$. Borrowing notation from the proof of Lemma 3.10, we can then write the domain $D(\phi)$ as a linear combination

$$D(\phi) = D' + (i - j)\underline{\Sigma} + a_\gamma P_\gamma + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i + \sum_{i=q+1}^{r} c_i S_i$$

with integer coefficients. As the multiplicities of D' at A and B are zero, we have that

$$\mathcal{F}([\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]) - \mathcal{F}([\mathbf{y} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, j]) = 2n_A(\phi) - n_B(\phi) = i - j \geq 0,$$

as desired.

Case 2: $(s, s') = (u_\gamma, v_\gamma)$. Suppose $s = u_\gamma$ and $s' = v_\gamma$. The proof of Lemma 3.10 shows that for g large enough and sufficient winding, no Whitney disk

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, \mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with domain

$$D(\phi) = D' + C - \underline{\Sigma} + a_\gamma P_\gamma + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i + \sum_{i=q+1}^{r} c_i S_i$$

can have both no negative multiplicities and $\mu(\phi) = 1$. Let us assume g is sufficiently large and that we have wound sufficiently so that this is the case. Suppose the coefficient in (36) is nonzero. Then there is a Whitney disk

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, \mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $\mu(\phi) = 1$, with no negative multiplicities, and with $n_z(\phi) = i - j \geq 0$. We can then write $D(\phi)$ as a linear combination

$$D(\phi) = D' + C - \underline{\Sigma} + (i-j)\underline{\Sigma} + a_\gamma P_\gamma + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i + \sum_{i=q+1}^{r} c_i S_i$$

with integer coefficients. Given our assumption on g and the winding, we cannot have $i-j = 0$. Thus, $i-j \geq 1$, which implies that

$$\mathcal{F}([\mathbf{x} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]) - \mathcal{F}([\mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, j]) = 2n_A(\phi) - n_B(\phi) = i - j - 1 \geq 0,$$

as desired.

Case 3: $(s, s') = (v_\gamma, u_\gamma)$. Suppose $s = v_\gamma$ and $s' = u_\gamma$. Suppose the coefficient in (36) is nonzero. Then there is a Whitney disk

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, \mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $\mu(\phi) = 1$, with no negative multiplicities, and with $n_z(\phi) = i - j \geq 0$. Then we can write $D(\phi)$ as a linear combination

$$D(\phi) = D' - C + \underline{\Sigma} + (i-j)\underline{\Sigma} + a_\gamma P_\gamma + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i + \sum_{i=q+1}^{r} c_i S_i$$

with integer coefficients. We therefore have that

$$\mathcal{F}([\mathbf{x} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]) - \mathcal{F}([\mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, j]) = 2n_A(\phi) - n_B(\phi) = i - j + 1 > 0,$$

as desired. □

Let ∂_0 denote the component of the differential ∂ on $CF^+(\gamma, \alpha | R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta)$ which preserves the grading $\mathcal{F}$, and let d denote the differential on

$$SFC(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \otimes \Lambda,$$

as in the proof of Lemma 3.9. We have the following.

Lemma 3.12. *Sufficiently large g and sufficient winding guarantees that for each generator*

$$[\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i] \text{ of } CF^+(\gamma, \alpha | R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta),$$

we have that

$$\partial_0([\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]) = \begin{cases} [d(\mathbf{x}) \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i] + [\mathbf{x} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i-1], & \text{if } s = u_\gamma, \\ [d(\mathbf{x}) \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i], & \text{if } s = v_\gamma. \end{cases} \tag{37}$$

Proof. Fix $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ as in (31). As usual, we will break the proof into three cases, according to whether $s = s'$ or $(s, s') = (u_\gamma, v_\gamma)$ or $(s, s') = (v_\gamma, u_\gamma)$.

Case 1: $s = s'$. Suppose $s = s'$. Suppose the coefficient

$$\langle \partial_0([\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]), [\mathbf{y} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, j] \rangle \tag{38}$$

is nonzero. Then there is a Whitney disk

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, \mathbf{y} \cup \{s'\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $\mu(\phi) = 1$, no negative multiplicities, $n_z(\phi) = i - j \geq 0$, and

$$2n_A(\phi) - n_B(\phi) = i - j = 0,$$

the latter of which follows from the proof of Lemma 3.11, *Case 1: $s = s'$*. The proof of Lemma 3.10, *Case 1: $s = s'$*, then shows that for sufficient winding, the domain $D(\phi)$ must be supported in Σ. It follows that

$$\langle \partial_0([\mathbf{x} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]), [\mathbf{y} \cup \{s\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, j] \rangle = \begin{cases} \langle d(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y} \rangle, & \text{if } j = i, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{39}$$

for any $s \in \{u_\gamma, v_\gamma\}$, as claimed in Lemma 3.12.

Case 2: $(s, s') = (u_\gamma, v_\gamma)$. Suppose $s = u_\gamma$ and $s' = v_\gamma$. Suppose the coefficient

$$\langle \partial_0([\mathbf{x} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]), [\mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, j] \rangle \tag{40}$$

is nonzero. Then there is a Whitney disk

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, \mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $\mu(\phi) = 1$, no negative multiplicities, $n_z(\phi) = i - j \geq 0$, and

$$2n_A(\phi) - n_B(\phi) = i - j - 1 = 0,$$

the latter of which follows from the proof of Lemma 3.11, *Case 2: $(s, s') = (u_\gamma, v_\gamma)$*, assuming we have wound sufficiently and g is large enough. As in that lemma, this implies that

$$D(\phi) = D' + C + a_\gamma P_\gamma + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i + \sum_{i=q+1}^{r} c_i S_i.$$

Note that $D(\phi)$ then has multiplicities $2 - a_\gamma$ and a_γ in the regions R_1 and R_2, respectively. It follows that $a_\gamma \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. For $a_\gamma = 1$ or 2, the same sort of argument as was used in the proof of Lemma 3.10, *Case 2: $(s, s') = (u_\gamma, v_\gamma)$*, shows that for sufficiently large g and sufficient winding, any such $D(\phi)$ must either have a negative multiplicity or $\mu(\phi) < 0$. So, we must have, for sufficiently large g and sufficient winding, that $a_\gamma = 0$. Therefore,

$$D(\phi) = D' + C + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i + \sum_{i=q+1}^{r} c_i S_i.$$

But in this case, another argument virtually identical to that in the proof of Lemma 3.10, *Case 2: $(s, s') = (u_\gamma, v_\gamma)$*, shows that for sufficient winding, any such $D(\phi)$ has a negative

multiplicity unless all $c_i = 0$ and $\partial D'$ is disjoint from α_i for $i = n{+}1, \dots, n{+}2g{+}1$. Thus,

$$D(\phi) = D' + C + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i.$$

The condition on $\partial D'$ implies that

$$D' + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i \subset \Sigma,$$

so that this domain is disjoint from C. In order for $\mu(\phi) = 1$, we must have

$$\mu\big(D' + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i\big) = 0$$

since the bigon C contributes 1 to Maslov index. Since holomorphic disks of Maslov index zero are constant, it follows that

$$D' + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i S_i = 0,$$

so that $D(\phi) = C$. Then ϕ has a unique holomorphic representative and $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}$. We may therefore conclude that for sufficiently large g and sufficient winding,

$$\langle \partial_0([\mathbf{x} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]), [\mathbf{y} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, j] \rangle = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} \text{ and } j = i - 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{41}$$

as claimed in Lemma 3.12.

Case 3: $(s, s') = (v_\gamma, u_\gamma)$. Suppose $s = v_\gamma$ and $s' = u_\gamma$. Suppose the coefficient

$$\langle \partial_0([\mathbf{x} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]), [\mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, j] \rangle \tag{42}$$

is nonzero. Then there is a Whitney disk

$$\phi \in \pi_2(\mathbf{x} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, \mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma)$$

with $\mu(\phi) = 1$, no negative multiplicities, $n_z(\phi) = i - j \geq 0$, and

$$2n_A(\phi) - n_B(\phi) = i - j + 1 = 0,$$

the latter of which follows from the proof of Lemma 3.11, *Case 3:* $(s, s') = (v_\gamma, u_\gamma)$. But these two conditions on $i{-}j$ contradict one another. Therefore,

$$\langle \partial_0([\mathbf{x} \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]), [\mathbf{y} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, j] \rangle = 0 \tag{43}$$

for all i, j and $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$. Putting the formulae (39), (41), and (43) together completes the proof of Lemma 3.12. □

Suppose now that g is large enough and that we have wound sufficiently for the conclusions of Lemmas 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, and 3.12 to hold. Note that the above filtration on $CF^+(\gamma, \alpha | R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta)$ defines a filtration on

$$SFC(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \otimes \Lambda$$

by simply declaring the filtration grading of a generator $\mathbf{x}$ to be equal to that of $[\mathbf{x}\cup\{u_\gamma\}\cup\mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0]$. In particular, $d = d_0$, where d_0 is the component of d which preserves the filtration grading on the sutured Floer complex, and f_γ is a filtered chain map. The E_1 page of the spectral sequence associated to the filtration on this sutured Floer complex is therefore simply the homology

$$H_*(SFC(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \otimes \Lambda, d_0) = SFH(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \otimes \Lambda.$$

We claim the following.

Lemma 3.13. *The map between E_1 pages induced by f_γ,*

$$E_1(f_\gamma) : SFH(\Sigma, \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}, \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}) \otimes \Lambda \to H_*(CF^+(\gamma, \alpha | R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta), \partial_0),$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. We claim that every generator of the homology

$$H_*(CF^+(\gamma, \alpha | R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta), \partial_0)$$

is represented by a linear combination of generators of the form $[\mathbf{x} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0]$. To see how the lemma follows from this claim, suppose it is true and recall that $E_1(f_\gamma)$ is induced by the map which sends a generator $\mathbf{x}$ to $[\mathbf{x} \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0]$. In particular, this map sends a linear combination

$$\mathbf{x}_1 \otimes r_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{x}_k \otimes r_k, \tag{44}$$

where the $r_i \in \Lambda$, to the linear combination

$$[\mathbf{x}_1 \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0]r_1 + \cdots + [\mathbf{x}_k \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, 0]r_k. \tag{45}$$

It follows easily from Lemma 3.12 that the sum in (44) is a cycle (resp. boundary) with respect to $d = d_0$ iff the sum in (45) is a cycle (resp. boundary) with respect to ∂_0. This implies that $E_1(f_\gamma)$ is an isomorphism.

It remains to prove the claim. Given a linear combination

$$w = \mathbf{x}_1 \otimes r_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{x}_k \otimes r_k, \tag{46}$$

as in (44), let us use the following notation

$$[w, u_\gamma, i] := [\mathbf{x}_1 \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]r_1 + \cdots + [\mathbf{x}_k \cup \{u_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]r_k,$$
$$[w, v_\gamma, i] := [\mathbf{x}_1 \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]r_1 + \cdots + [\mathbf{x}_k \cup \{v_\gamma\} \cup \mathbf{x}_\gamma, i]r_k.$$

Now suppose

$$c = [w_i, u_\gamma, i] + [z_i, v_\gamma, i] + \cdots + [w_0, u_\gamma, 0] + [z_0, v_\gamma, 0]$$

is a cycle with respect to ∂_0, where the w_j and v_j are linear combinations as in (46). For the claim, it suffices to show that there is some

$$b \in CF^+(\gamma, \alpha | R_\gamma; \Gamma_\eta)$$

such that

$$\partial_0 b + c = [w_0, u_\gamma, 0]. \tag{47}$$

Applying the formula for ∂_0 in (37), one easily sees that the fact that c is a cycle implies that

$$\begin{aligned} dz_i &= 0, \\ dz_{i-1} &= w_i, \\ dz_{i-2} &= w_{i-1}, \\ &\vdots \\ dz_0 &= w_1. \end{aligned}$$

It therefore follows, after another application of (37), that

$$b = [z_i, u_\gamma, i+1] + \cdots + [z_0, u_\gamma, 1]$$

satisfies (47). This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 3.5. The fact that f_γ is a quasi-isomorphism follows immediately, because a filtered chain map between filtered chain complexes which induces an isomorphism between the E_1 pages of the associated spectral sequences induces an isomorphism on homology, assuming that the filtrations are bounded from below, which they clearly are in this case (see, e.g., the proof of [46, Proposition A.6.1]). □

The proof of our Main Theorem, Theorem 1.2 is now complete.

4. Obstructing Lagrangian concordance

In this section, we provide further examples which demonstrate the effectiveness of the invariant Θ_{HF} in obstructing Lagrangian concordance. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 4.1. *There are infinitely many pairs (K_1, K_2) of Legendrian knots in (S^3, ξ_{std}) such that:*

- *K_1 and K_2 are smoothly concordant and have the same classical invariants tb and r,*
- *K_1 is a negative stabilization of another Legendrian knot,*
- *K_2 is neither a positive nor negative stabilization of another Legendrian knot, and*
- *$\Theta_{HF}(K_1) \neq 0$ while $\Theta_{HF}(K_2) = 0$.*

In particular, the last condition implies by Theorem 1.11 that there is no Lagrangian concordance from K_1 to K_2.

The fact that K_1 in Theorem 4.1 is a stabilization implies that its Legendrian contact homology DGA is trivial. Legendrian contact homology therefore fails to obstruct a Lagrangian concordance from K_1 to K_2 for these examples.

In our proof of Theorem 4.1 below, we will adopt the convention that the (p, q)-cable of a knot K, denoted by $C_{p,q}(K)$, has longitudinal winding p and meridional winding q. We will also, for notational convenience, we will denote the (r, s)-cable of $C_{p,q}(K)$ simply by

$$C_{p,q;r,s}(K) := C_{r,s}(C_{p,q}(K)).$$

Given a Legendrian knot K, we will use K^+ to denote its transverse pushoff which satisfies

$$sl(K^+) = tb(K) - r(K).$$

Finally, given a knot K we will denote by $\overline{tb}(K)$ and $\overline{sl}(K)$ the maximal Thurston-Bennequin and self-linking numbers among Legendrian and transverse knots smoothly isotopic to K.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. In our examples, K_1 will be a Legendrian representative of the iterated torus knot $C_{3,2;3,2}(U)$ and K_2 will be a Legendrian representative of

$$C_{3,2;3,2}(P(-m,-3,3))\#6_1,$$

where $P(-m,-3,3)$ is the usual pretzel knot, for any $m \geq 3$. Such K_1 and K_2 are smoothly concordant as these pretzel knots and the twist knot 6_1 are all smoothly slice.

To define the Legendrian representative K_1, we rely on the following result of Ng, Ozsváth, and Thurston from [39, Section 3.3]. The Legendrian K in the proposition below was first discovered and studied by Etnyre and Honda in [16].

Proposition 4.2 (Ng–Ozsváth–Thurston)**.** *There is a Legendrian representative K of the iterated torus knot $C_{3,2;3,2}(U)$ with $(tb(K), r(K)) = (5,2)$ and $\Theta_{HF}(K) \neq 0$.*

We then define K_1 to be the Legendrian knot obtained by negatively stabilizing this knot K three times. It follows that

$$(tb(K_1), r(K_1)) = (2,-1) \text{ and } \Theta_{HF}(K_1) \neq 0$$

since Θ_{HF} is preserved by negative stabilization.

We now record some facts that will be relevant in defining K_2. First, we record that $\overline{sl}(C_{3,2;3,2}(U)) = 7$, where this maximal self-linking number is realized by the transverse pushoff of the unique Legendrian representative with $(tb, r) = (6,-1)$; see [16] for the full Legendrian classification of $C_{3,2;3,2}(U)$. Since $g(C_{3,2;3,2}(U)) = 4$, the three inequalities

$$\overline{sl}(C_{3,2;3,2}(U)) \leq 2\tau(C_{3,2;3,2}(U)) - 1 \leq 2g_s(C_{3,2;3,2}(U)) - 1 \leq 2g(C_{3,2;3,2}(U)) - 1$$

are actually equalities. Here, τ is the Ozsváth–Szabó concordance invariant [41] and g_s is the smooth slice genus; see [49] for the first inequality and [41] for the second. In particular, we have that $\tau(C_{3,2;3,2}(U)) = 4$. We now use these facts to prove the following.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose K is a smoothly slice knot with $\overline{tb}(K) = -1$. Then there is a Legendrian representative of $C_{3,2;3,2}(K)$ with $(tb, r) = (6,-1)$. This Legendrian knot achieves the bound $\overline{tb}(C_{3,2;3,2}(K)) = 6$, and its transverse pushoff achieves the bound $\overline{sl}(C_{3,2;3,2}(K)) = 7$.*

Proof. According to [34, Corollary 1.17], we have $\overline{tb}(C_{3,2}(K)) \geq 1$. As $C_{3,2}(K)$ is smoothly concordant to the right-handed trefoil $C_{3,2}(U)$, we have

$$\tau(C_{3,2}(K)) = \tau(C_{3,2}(U)) = 1,$$

which implies that

$$\overline{tb}(C_{3,2}(K)) \leq 2\tau(C_{3,2}(K)) - 1 = 1$$

by [49]. It follows that $\overline{tb}(C_{3,2}(K)) = 1$. Applying [34, Corollary 1.17] once more, we may then conclude that $\overline{tb}(C_{3,2;3,2}(K)) = 6$, as claimed in the lemma. Since $C_{3,2;3,2}(K)$ is smoothly concordant to $C_{3,2;3,2}(U)$, we have that

$$\tau(C_{3,2;3,2}(K)) = \tau(C_{3,2;3,2}(U)) = 4,$$

and, therefore, that

$$\overline{sl}(C_{3,2;3,2}(K)) \leq 2\tau(C_{3,2;3,2}(K)) - 1 = 7.$$

This bound is achieved by the transverse pushoff of a tb-maximizing Legendrian representative: since $tb = 6$ is even for this representative its rotation number must be odd, and up to reversing orientation we can ensure that $r \leq -1$; hence, the transverse pushoff has $sl = tb - r \geq 7$, which implies that this inequality is actually an equality. □

There are infinitely many knots K satisfying the hypothesis of Lemma 4.3. These include the examples of [12, Theorem 2.10] and the pretzel knots $P(-m, -3, 3)$, for $m \geq 3$, as mentioned in [12, Section 4.4]. Fix any such K and let L_1 be a Legendrian representative of $C_{3,2;3,2}(K)$ with $tb(L_1) = 6$ and $r(L_1) = -1$, whose existence is guaranteed by Lemma 4.3.

Etnyre, Ng, and Vértesi [17] classified Legendrian and transverse representatives of the 6_1 knot, which in their notation is the twist knot K_4. Namely, there is a single tb-maximizing Legendrian representative L_2 with $(tb, r) = (-5, 0)$, and all other representatives are stabilizations of L_2, so it follows that $\overline{tb}(6_1) = -5$ and $\overline{sl}(6_1) = -5$.

We now define the Legendrian representative K_2 of $C_{3,2;3,2}(K)\#6_1$ to be the connected sum $K_2 = L_1\#L_2$. We show below that K_2 satisfies the conditions in Theorem 4.1.

Proposition 4.4. *The Legendrian knot K_2 has the same classical invariants as K_1, it is not a stabilization, and $\Theta_{HF}(K_2) = 0$.*

Proof. Both L_1 and L_2 maximize tb within their knot types, so we have

$$tb(K_2) = tb(L_1) + tb(L_2) + 1 = \overline{tb}(L_1) + \overline{tb}(L_2) + 1 = \overline{tb}(K_2)$$

by Lemma 3.3 and Corollary 3.5 of [15]. More precisely, we compute that $tb(K_2) = 2$ and

$$r(K_2) = r(L_1) + r(L_2) = -1.$$

This shows that K_2 has the same classical invariants as K_1. The fact that K_2 is a tb-maximizer also implies that it is not a stabilization. In order to show that $\Theta_{HF}(K_2) = 0$, we appeal to a result of Vértesi [59, Corollary 1.3], which says that there is an isomorphism

$$\widehat{HFK}(m(L_1)) \otimes \widehat{HFK}(m(L_2)) \to \widehat{HFK}(m(L_1\#L_2))$$

sending

$$\Theta_{HF}(L_1) \otimes \Theta_{HF}(L_2) \text{ to } \Theta_{HF}(L_1\#L_2) = \Theta_{HF}(K_2).$$

It therefore suffices to show that $\Theta_{HF}(L_2) = 0$. But L_2 represents an alternating knot type, so it has thin knot Floer homology [40]. Therefore, by [39, Proposition 3.4], we have $\Theta_{HF}(L_2) \neq 0$ if and only if $sl(L_2^+) = 2\tau(L_2) - 1$. The left side is -5, but the right side is -1 since L_2 is smoothly slice, so we have that $\Theta_{HF}(L_2) = 0$, as desired. □

This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1. □

References

[1] J.A. Baldwin. Comultiplication in link Floer homology and transversely non-simple links. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 10:1417–1436, 2010.

[2] John A. Baldwin and Adam Simon Levine. A combinatorial spanning tree model for knot Floer homology. *Adv. Math.*, 231(3-4):1886–1939, 2012.

[3] John A. Baldwin and Steven Sivek. A contact invariant in sutured monopole homology. arXiv:1403.1930, 2014.

[4] John A. Baldwin and Steven Sivek. Instanton Floer homology and contact structures. arXiv:1405.3278, 2014.

[5] John A. Baldwin and Steven Sivek. Invariants of Legendrian and transverse knots in monopole knot homology. arXiv:1405.3275, 2014.

[6] John A. Baldwin and Steven Sivek. Naturality in sutured monopole and instanton homology. *J. Differential Geom.*, 100(3):395–480, 2015.

[7] John A. Baldwin, David Shea Vela-Vick, and Vera Vértesi. On the equivalence of Legendrian and transverse invariants in knot Floer homology. *Geom. Topol.*, 17:925–974, 2013.

[8] Baptiste Chantraine. Lagrangian concordance of Legendrian knots. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 10(1):63–85, 2010.

[9] V. Colin, P. Ghiggini, and K. Honda. The equivalence of Heegaard Floer homology and embedded contact homology III: from hat to plus. arXiv:1208.1526, 2012.

[10] V. Colin, P. Ghiggini, and K. Honda. The equivalence of Heegaard Floer homology and embedded contact homology via open book decompositions I. arXiv:1208.1074, 2012.

[11] V. Colin, P. Ghiggini, and K. Honda. The equivalence of Heegaard Floer homology and embedded contact homology via open book decompositions II. arXiv:1208.1077, 2012.

[12] Christopher R. Cornwell, Lenhard Ng, and Steven Sivek. Obstructions to Lagrangian concordance. arXiv:1411.1364, 2014.

[13] Tobias Ekholm, Ko Honda, and Tamás Kálmán. Legendrian knots and exact Lagrangian cobordisms. arXiv:1212.1519, 2012.

[14] Yakov Eliashberg. Invariants in contact topology. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. II (Berlin, 1998)*, number Extra Vol. II, pages 327–338, 1998.

[15] J. B. Etnyre and K. Honda. On connected sums and Legendrian knots. *Adv. Math.*, 179(1):59–74, 2003.

[16] J. B. Etnyre and K. Honda. Cabling and transverse simplicity. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 162(3):1305–1333, 2005.

[17] John B. Etnyre, Lenhard L. Ng, and Vera Vértesi. Legendrian and transverse twist knots. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 15(3):969–995, 2013.

[18] K. Honda. On the classification of tight contact structures, I. *Geom. Topol.*, 4:309–368, 2000.

[19] Ko Honda, William H. Kazez, and Gordana Matić. The contact invariant in sutured Floer homology. *Invent. Math.*, 176(3):637–676, 2009.

[20] Michael Hutchings and Clifford Henry Taubes. Proof of the Arnold chord conjecture in three dimensions, II. *Geom. Topol.*, 17(5):2601–2688, 2013.

[21] András Juhász. Holomorphic discs and sutured manifolds. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 6:1429–1457, 2006.

[22] Yutaka Kanda. On the Thurston-Bennequin invariant of Legendrian knots and nonexactness of Bennequin's inequality. *Invent. Math.*, 133(2):227–242, 1998.

[23] Tirasan Khandhawit and Lenhard Ng. A family of transversely nonsimple knots. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 10(1):293–314, 2010.

[24] P. Kronheimer and T. Mrowka. Monopoles and contact structures. *Invent. Math.*, 130:209–255, 1997.

[25] P. Kronheimer, T. Mrowka, P. Ozsváth, and Z. Szabó. Monopoles and lens space surgeries. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 165(2):457–546, 2007.

[26] Peter Kronheimer and Tomasz Mrowka. *Monopoles and three-manifolds*, volume 10 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.

[27] Peter Kronheimer and Tomasz Mrowka. Knots, sutures, and excision. *J. Differential Geom.*, 84(2):301–364, 2010.

[28] C. Kutluhan, Y.-J. Lee, and C. H. Taubes. HF = HM I: Heegaard Floer homology and Seiberg-Witten Floer homology. arXiv:1007.1979, 2010.
[29] C. Kutluhan, Y.-J. Lee, and C. H. Taubes. HF = HM II: Reeb orbits and holomorphic curves for the ech/Heegaard-Floer correspondence. arXiv:1008.1595, 2010.
[30] C. Kutluhan, Y.-J. Lee, and C. H. Taubes. HF = HM III: Holomorphic curves and the differential for the ech/Heegaard-Floer correspondence. arXiv:1010.3456, 2010.
[31] C. Kutluhan, Y.-J. Lee, and C. H. Taubes. HF = HM IV: The Seiberg-Witten Floer homology and ech correspondence. arXiv:1107.2297, 2011.
[32] C. Kutluhan, Y.-J. Lee, and C. H. Taubes. HF = HM V: Seiberg-Witten Floer homology and handle additions. arXiv:1204.0115, 2012.
[33] Yankı Lekili. Heegaard-Floer homology of broken fibrations over the circle. *Adv. Math.*, 244:268–302, 2013.
[34] Tye Lidman and Steven Sivek. Contact structures and reducible surgeries. arXiv:1410.0303, 2014.
[35] R. Lipshitz. A cylindrical reformulation of Heegaard Floer homology. *Geom. Topol.*, 10:955–1096, 2006.
[36] Paolo Lisca, Peter Ozsváth, András I. Stipsicz, and Zoltán Szabó. Heegaard Floer invariants of Legendrian knots in contact three-manifolds. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 11(6):1307–1363, 2009.
[37] C. Manolescu. An unoriented skein exact triangle for knot Floer homology. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 14:839–852, 2007.
[38] T. Mrowka and Y. Rollin. Legendrian knots and monopoles. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 6:1–69, 2006.
[39] L. Ng, P. Ozsváth, and D. Thurston. Transverse knots distinguished by knot Floer homology. *J. Symp. Geom.*, 6(4):461–490, 2008.
[40] P. Ozsváth and Z. Szabó. Heegaard Floer homology and alternating knots. *Geom. Topol.*, 7:225–254, 2003.
[41] P. Ozsváth and Z. Szabó. Knot Floer homology and the four-ball genus. *Geom. Topol.*, 7:615–639, 2003.
[42] P. Ozsváth and Z. Szabó. Holomorphic disks and three-manifold invariants: properties and applications. *Ann. Math.*, 159(3):1159–1245, 2004.
[43] P. Ozsváth and Z. Szabó. Holomorphic disks and topological invariants for closed three-manifolds. *Ann. Math.*, 159(3):1027–1158, 2004.
[44] P. Ozsváth and Z. Szabó. Heegaard Floer homologies and contact structures. *Duke Math. J.*, 129(1):39–61, 2005.
[45] P. Ozsváth and Z. Szabó. Holomorphic triangles and invariants for smooth four-manifolds. *Adv. Math.*, 202(2):326–400, 2005.
[46] P. Ozsváth, Z. Szabó, and A. Stipsicz. *Grid homology for knots and links*, volume 208 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, 2015.
[47] P. Ozsváth, Z. Szabó, and D. Thurston. Legendrian knots, transverse knots, and combinatorial Floer homology. *Geom. Topol.*, 12:941–980, 2008.
[48] Peter Ozsváth and András I. Stipsicz. Contact surgeries and the transverse invariant in knot Floer homology. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 9(3):601–632, 2010.
[49] Olga Plamenevskaya. Bounds for the Thurston-Bennequin number from Floer homology. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 4:399–406, 2004.
[50] Steven Sivek. Monopole Floer homology and Legendrian knots. *Geom. Topol.*, 16:751–779, 2012.
[51] Steven Sivek. The contact homology of Legendrian knots with maximal Thurston-Bennequin invariant. *J. Symplectic Geom.*, 11(2):167–178, 2013.
[52] András I. Stipsicz and Vera Vértesi. On invariants for Legendrian knots. *Pacific J. Math.*, 239(1):157–177, 2009.
[53] C. H. Taubes. Embedded contact homology and Seiberg-Witten Floer cohomology, I. *Geom. Topol.*, 14:2497–2581, 2010.
[54] C. H. Taubes. Embedded contact homology and Seiberg-Witten Floer cohomology, II. *Geom. Topol.*, 14:2583–2720, 2010.
[55] C. H. Taubes. Embedded contact homology and Seiberg-Witten Floer cohomology, III. *Geom. Topol.*, 14:2721–2817, 2010.
[56] C. H. Taubes. Embedded contact homology and Seiberg-Witten Floer cohomology, IV. *Geom. Topol.*, 14:2819–2960, 2010.

[57] C. H. Taubes. Embedded contact homology and Seiberg-Witten Floer cohomology, V. *Geom. Topol.*, 14:2961–3000, 2010.
[58] Clifford Henry Taubes. The Seiberg-Witten equations and the Weinstein conjecture. *Geom. Topol.*, 11:2117–2202, 2007.
[59] Vera Vértesi. Transversely nonsimple knots. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 8(3):1481–1498, 2008.

Department of Mathematics, Boston College

E-mail address: john.baldwin@bc.edu

Department of Mathematics, Princeton University

E-mail address: ssivek@math.princeton.edu